

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 146 866

HE 009 432

TITLE Ministry on Campus. A United Methodist Mission Statement and Survey Report.

INSTITUTION National Commission on United Methodist Higher Education, Nashville, Tenn.

PUB DATE 77

NOTE 95p.

AVAILABLE FROM Office of Interpretation, Board of Higher Education and Ministry, P.O. Box 871, Nashville, Tenn. 37202

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$4.67 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Church Programs; Church Responsibility; *Church Role; *Clergymen; Higher Education; Objectives; Policy; Private Colleges; *Religious Education; *Religious Organizations; State Colleges; State Universities

IDENTIFIERS *United Methodist Church

ABSTRACT

Reported are the results of a survey of 222 United Methodist campus ministers across the country in both private and public colleges and universities. The report covers the personal backgrounds and careers of the ministers, their views of campus ministry goals and programs, how the campus ministries are financed and administered, and the quality of service provided the ministries by the denomination and other support institutions. In addition, a statement on the mission of United Methodist campus ministry that is to be recommended as a policy statement is reprinted. It lists the concerns of campus ministry, points to its challenges, and concludes that campus ministry is required by the understanding of ministry in the church, and calls on the church at large to strengthen its support. (MSE)

* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

ED146866

Ministry on Campus

A United Methodist Mission Statement and Survey Report

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON UNITED METHODIST HIGHER EDUCATION

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

*Board of Higher
Education & Ministry*

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND
USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON UNITED METHODIST HIGHER EDUCATION



MEMBERSHIP

PAUL HARDIN

*President, Drew University
Chairman*

JAMES C. CORMAN

U. S. Congressman, California

AUGUST W. EBERLE

*Professor of Higher Education
Indiana University*

LLOYD C. ELAM

President, Meharry Medical College

THOMAS K. KIM

President, McMurry College

JAMES K. MATHEWS

*Resident Bishop, Baltimore
and Peninsula Conferences,
The United Methodist Church*

JOHN F. MURPHY

*Executive Secretary, College and
University Department, National
Catholic Educational Association*

WILLA B. PLAYER

*Director, Division of College Support,
U. S. Office of Education, Department
of Health, Education and Welfare*

ROBERT RANKIN

Vice President, The Danforth Foundation

ROY B. SHILLING, JR.

President, Hendrix College

JOHN R. SILBER

President, Boston University

HARRY E. SMITH

*Executive Director, Society for Values
in Higher Education*

ELMER B. STAATS

Comptroller General of the United States

RALPH M. TANNER

*Professor of History
Birmingham-Southern College*

CAROLYN WARNER

*Superintendent of Public Instruction,
Department of Education, Arizona*

STAFF

T. MICHAEL ELLIOTT

Executive Director

RENÉE G. LOEFFLER

Associate Director

KENT M. WEEKS

Associate Director

DIANE DILLARD

Assistant to the Director

National Commission on United Methodist Higher Education

P.O. Box 871

Nashville, Tennessee 37202

615/327-2709

MINISTRY ON CAMPUS

Ministry on Campus

**A United Methodist Mission Statement
and Survey Report**



**National Commission on United Methodist Higher Education
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE**

Copyright © 1977

National Commission on United Methodist Higher Education
P. O. Box 871
Nashville, Tennessee 37202

This document is National Commission document CD-85.

Limited additional copies of this volume may be obtained by writing to the Office of Interpretation, Board of Higher Education and Ministry, P.O. Box 871, Nashville, Tennessee 37202.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	7
National Commission on United Methodist Higher Education ...	9
Foreword	11
Introduction	13
 PART ONE UNITED METHODIST STATEMENTS ON CAMPUS MINISTRY	
The Mission of The United Methodist Church in Its Campus Ministry	17
Churchwide Support for Campus Ministries	24
 PART TWO ANALYSIS OF SURVEY OF UNITED METHODIST CAMPUS MINISTERS	
CHAPTER 1	
Campus Ministers: Personal Backgrounds and Careers	27
CHAPTER 2	
Campus Ministry Goals and Programs	38
CHAPTER 3	
Financing, Staffing, and Governance of Campus Ministries	54
CHAPTER 4	
Services for Campus Ministry	62
CHAPTER 5	
Conclusion	65
 APPENDICES	
APPENDIX A	
Data on Response Rate and Personal Backgrounds of Campus Ministers	68

APPENDIX B

Factor Analysis of Mission, Function and Organizational Statements	71
---	-----------

APPENDIX C

Survey of United Methodist Campus Ministers	74
--	-----------

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES

1. Occupation Immediately Before Entry Into Campus Ministry, by Type of Position	28
2. Reasons Reported for Entering Campus Ministry	29
3. Most Important Reason for Entering Campus Ministry, by Type of Position	30
4. Means Used to Secure Current Position, by Type of Position	31
5. Length of Time Campus Ministers Reported Wishing to Remain in Campus Ministry, by Type of Position	32
6. Primary Source of Professional Peer Relationships, by Type of Position	33
7. Respondents' Feelings About Being in a Special Appointment, by Type of Position	34
8. Type of Higher Education Institution, by Type of Campus Ministry Position	35
9. Enrollments in Higher Education Institutions Served by Campus Ministers, by Type of Position	36
10. Mean Responses of Campus Ministers When Assigning Importance to Campus Ministry Purpose and Mission Statements	38
11. Mean Responses of Campus Ministers When Assigning Importance to Campus Ministry Function Statements	42
12. Five Function Statements Rated as Most Important in "Ought" and "Constituency" Ratings, in Rank Order	45
13. Mean Responses to Importance of Function Statements, by Type of Position	46
14. Mean Responses of Campus Ministers When Assigning Importance to Campus Ministry Administrative and Organizational Statements	48
15. Mean Importance Assigned to Administrative and Organizational Activities, by Type of Position	49
16. Percent of Professional Staff Time That Should Be Allocated to Four Modes of Campus Ministry	50
17. Percent of Professional Time Actually Allocated to Four Modes of Campus Ministry	51
18. Percent of Professional Staff Time Given to Students	52
19. Number of Students Involved in Campus Ministry Programs	52
20. Campus Ministry Expenditures	54
21. Campus Ministry Expenditures, by Type of Ministry, 1976-77	55
22. Annual Conference Support for Campus Ministry, 1972-1975	56
23. Support for Campus Ministry by Jurisdiction, 1975	56

24. Contributions to Campus Ministries, Per Church Member by Annual Conferences Within Each Jurisdiction, 1975	57
25. Size of Campus Ministry Staff	58
26. Ministers' Evaluation of Governing Boards	59
27. Importance of Possible Governing Board Roles	60
28. Locus of Accountability of Campus Ministries	61
29. Sources of National Services for Campus Ministry	62
30. Campus Ministers' Assessment of Importance and Quality of National Services	63
31. Frequency of Use of Services by Campus Ministers	64

APPENDIX TABLES

A.1. Number of Campus Ministers on Mailing List, Number of Surveys Returned, and Percentage Response Rate	68
A.2. Age of Respondents at Time of Survey	68
A.3. Sex of Respondents	69
A.4. Race of Respondents	69
A.5. Respondents' Highest Earned General Education Degree	69
A.6. Respondents' Highest Level of Theological Education	69
A.7. Number of Years Spent by Respondents in Campus Ministry	70
B.1. List of Underlying Factors in Responses to "Ought" Questions, Determined by Factor Analysis	72
B.2. Factors Produced by Factor Analysis of Responses to Questions Concerning Importance Various Purposes, Functions and Activities Should Have in Campus Ministry Programs	72

THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON UNITED METHODIST HIGHER EDUCATION

The National Commission on United Methodist Higher Education was established by the Board of Higher Education and Ministry of The United Methodist Church in January, 1975. The National Commission's work consists of five broad areas of investigation:

1. An analysis of church policy with respect to The United Methodist Church's involvement in higher education through related institutions, campus ministries, and the support services of the Board of Higher Education and Ministry.
2. An analysis of the environment in which higher education functions and in which it will function in the future, including social, economic, and demographic trends which will affect independent higher education and the church.
3. An analysis of public policy and legal issues related to institutional/state and church/state relationships. Alternative social goals for public policy will be examined along with strategies to implement such goals.
4. An analysis of institutional goals, problems, organizational relationships, support structures, and institutional health, including modeling of effects of alternative church and public policies.
5. An analysis of the current system of campus ministries, including goals, problems, organizational relationships and support structures.

Recommendations based on these analyses will be developed for the appropriate constituencies including public policy makers, institutions, campus ministries, and church members and officials.

Recognizing that many of the problems and concerns the National Commission will be addressing are not peculiarly United Methodist but involve all of independent and especially church-related higher education, an *Interdenominational Advisory Group* to the National Commission was formed. The *Interdenominational Advisory Group* consists of staff from the following:

African Methodist Episcopal Church
American Baptist Church
American Lutheran Church
Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)
Christian Methodist Episcopal Church
Lutheran Church in America
Lutheran Educational Conference
of North America

National Catholic Education Assn.
National Council of Churches
Presbyterian Church in the U.S.
Southern Baptist Convention
United Churches of Christ
United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.

Representatives from the above denominations and organizations have committed their time to the work of the National Commission and are sources of information and insight.

The National Commission is an extraordinary organization in several respects. First, the National Commission is a true *ad hoc* organization, designed to self-destruct at the end of two and a half years. No resources will be expended to perpetuate either the Commission or positions for its staff. Second, the National Commission's charge was totally open-ended. There are no *a priori* conclusions or commitments to the status quo in United Methodist higher education with respect to either campus ministries or institutions. Even the Board of Higher Education and Ministry, the Commission's parent organization, has opened itself to examination and evaluation by the National Commission. Third, the National Commission staff are independent-minded generalists in higher education. They are committed to rigorous scholarship in the conduct of the various research studies and the formulation of the National Commission policy recommendations. Finally, the National Commission membership is a highly diversified group of persons, each having achieved distinction in his or her own right. This collective experience and wisdom constitute an extraordinary resource committed to what is probably the most comprehensive study ever undertaken by any denomination of its interest and investment in higher education.

FOREWORD

The United Methodist Church was one of the first to recognize the importance of extending its ministry to the college campuses of the nation. The need for such a ministry was particularly great at state and other institutions not affiliated with any religious group. This ministry of the church in higher education remains vital today. In our mission statement on campus ministry, the National Commission on United Methodist Higher Education has reaffirmed the importance of bringing Christ's ministry to the campus. The statement recognizes that ministry is similar to all the ministries of Christ in the world, but that it is distinguished by its particular setting and by the specific needs and problems of those who work and study in higher education institutions.

The United Methodist Church is called upon by the Gospel to address the Word of God to the whole of higher education. Thus, The United Methodist Church is present in institutions of higher education to call people to the Lordship of Christ; to encourage teaching and scholarship that is both intellectually rigorous and humane; to hold institutions accountable for humane values; to help institutions fulfill their mission to people; to gather a community of the faithful; and to help people within the university anticipate and work for a better society. For all these reasons, the National Commission on United Methodist Higher Education has declared that The United Methodist Church should continue and strengthen, with faithfulness and imagination, the witness of its campus ministry in higher education.

Paul Hardin

INTRODUCTION

This is one of a series of volumes published by the National Commission on United Methodist Higher Education. In this volume the Commission focuses on the important role of campus ministry in helping to fulfill the church's mission in higher education. Part One of the volume consists of two sections. The first is the National Commission's statement on campus ministry, "The Mission of The United Methodist Church in its Campus Ministry." The National Commission's statement is a normative one, describing the hope and ideal of a United Methodist ministry on the campus. The statement includes a brief history of campus ministry and a discussion of its distinctive character. In its statement, the National Commission discusses the reasons The United Methodist Church should continue to support and strengthen its campus ministries, identifies the central concerns of campus ministry, and sets forth objectives from which criteria can be developed relating to the faithfulness and accountability of campus ministry. Finally, some new directions for campus ministry are suggested.

The second statement in Part One of the volume is a resolution on support of campus ministry initiated by the National Commission and later adopted by the 1976 General Conference, "Churchwide Support for Campus Ministries." In that statement, the General Conference reaffirmed its support for campus ministry. It noted the pioneering role of The United Methodist Church in developing campus ministry work and the need to minister to the majority of United Methodist college students who are enrolled in colleges and universities not affiliated with the church.

The second part of this volume reports the results of staff research in the area, concentrating on a survey of United Methodist campus ministers conducted in the fall of 1976. The purpose of the survey was two-fold: to obtain information about the current purposes, activities, and organization of the campus ministries in which United Methodist ministers work; and to learn the views of those ministers concerning both their current operations and their aspirations for campus ministry. The survey instrument was developed in consultation with the Section of Campus Ministry of the Division of Higher Education and Dr. Douglas Johnson of the *Institute for Church Development*. Dr. Johnson also did the preliminary analysis of the response data. Topics covered in the survey analysis include: the personal backgrounds and career patterns

of United Methodist campus ministers; evaluations by campus ministers of the relative importance of various goals, functions, and activities in both their current campus ministry programs and in what they would consider to be an ideal campus ministry program; financing, staffing, and governance patterns; and evaluations by the ministers of various national services available to campus ministers. Included in the appendices is a copy of the questionnaire used in the survey.

There are many to whom the Commission and its staff are indebted for their assistance in preparing these materials. Commission members Robert Rankin and Harry E. Smith both played a key role in the development of the National Commission's statement on campus ministry. W. Cecil Findley and Allan Burry made major contributions both to the preparation of the National Commission statement and the preparation and analysis of the Campus Ministry Survey. Others deserving special thanks are: Allyn D. Axelton; Loretta Glaze Elliott; Joseph L. Gipson; Philip S. Kronenberg; Eugene A. Ransom; Thomas Raper; Robert W. Thornberg; F. Thomas Trotter; and Karen Hanke Weeks.

The many revisions of the manuscripts which form this volume have required the skill and patience of an outstanding clerical staff. Commission secretaries Mrs. Connie L. Edwards and Ms. Kathryn C. Grogan have provided excellent service, and Ms. Toni Flynn provided outstanding editorial assistance. Mrs. Frances M. Graham, the Commission's office manager, has been responsible for coordinating the total support staff effort for the Commission in an exceptional manner. Graphic designer and layout artist for National Commission publications is Hermann F. Zimmermann of Design-Graphics, Inc., Nashville, Tennessee. To all of these we acknowledge our debt and express our gratitude.

While the contributions of the persons listed above have been invaluable, in the final analysis it is the National Commission, in the instance of its statement in Part One, and the National Commission staff, in the instance of Part Two, who must accept the full responsibility for the contents printed therein.

T. Michael Elliott

United Methodist Statements on Campus Ministry

The first statement reproduced here was adopted by the National Commission on United Methodist Higher Education on November 29, 1975. It is the Commission's official statement on the mission of United Methodist campus ministry, and is recommended to the Board of Higher Education and Ministry and the 1980 General Conference for adoption as a policy statement by those agencies.

The second statement is a resolution on support of campus ministry that was initiated by the National Commission and later adopted by the 1976 General Conference as a statement of the whole church.

PART ONE



The Mission of The United Methodist Church in Its Campus Ministry

United Methodism's connection with higher education began with the Wesleys at Oxford and the "Holy Clubs." That commitment has continued to be an important element of United Methodist life, as is shown by the highly successful movements to establish and support both colleges and campus ministries. The mission of The United Methodist Church in its related institutions of higher education extends through 120 colleges, universities, and professional schools. The mission of The United Methodist Church in its campus ministries extends through ministries at institutions not related to The United Methodist Church and through chaplains at United Methodist-related institutions.

The rich and varied history of campus ministry began with the more limited concept of "student work" as carried out by the Student Christian Movement. In the case of the former Methodist tradition, this movement developed through Wesley Foundations and the many programs that they supported. Campus programs of the Evangelical United Brethren tradition were often ecumenical. These movements recognized the importance of ministry in growing state institutions. The initial impetus for the formation of ministries in state institutions was the church's apprehension about state supported higher education and a desire to nurture Methodist students by offering them a "home away from home."

This limited concept of campus ministry has expanded to include a lively concern for the whole campus. Campus ministry has sought involvement with the entire university to enhance the quality of life in the whole institution. This sense of mission led to United Methodist cooperation with other denominations in order to broaden and enrich its ministry.

Campus ministry, like all ministry, needs continuous evaluation. The United Methodist Church has a significant investment of people and property in campus ministries; an increasingly large number of its members are in non-church colleges and universities; and the older and established patterns of ministry—both denominational and ecumenical—are being questioned. These realities underline a need for review.

clarification of mission, possible redirection and assessment of the adequacy of support for campus ministry programs.

Ministry in The United Methodist Church

All Christians are called to minister to others, following the example of Jesus Christ. Our ministry is carried out in Christ's name and by His authority. As the *Discipline of The United Methodist Church* (1976) explains:

All Christian ministry is Christ's ministry of outreaching love. . . . All Christians are called to this ministry of servanthood in the world to the glory of God and for human fulfillment. The forms of this ministry are diverse in locale, in interest, and in denominational accent, yet also always catholic in spirit and outreach. (Par. 101)

This ministry, to which all are called by their baptism and confirmation, includes witness and nurture, outreach and service.

The general ministry is facilitated by the representative or specialized ministries of those ordained for word, sacrament and order and who "are committed to becoming conscious representatives of the whole gospel and are responsible for the transmission of that gospel to the end that all the world may be saved." (Par. 445.1)

The ordained ministry is defined by its intentionally representative character, by its passion for the hallowing of life, and by its concern to link all local ministries with the widest boundaries of the Christian community. (Par. 108)

The general and representative orders of ministry in The United Methodist Church are complementary. Neither is subservient to the other. Both are summoned and sent by Christ to live and work together in mutual interdependence and to be guided by the Spirit into the truth that frees and the love that reconciles. (Par. 110)

Ministry in The United Methodist Church is the general ministry as enabled by lay and ordained ministers. Through their ministry, both ordained and lay professionals work to enable the general ministry of the church to manifest God's presence and will through witness and service.

Campus Ministry

The distinctiveness of campus ministry is that it is Christ's ministry present in a university community. Campus ministry is similar to all the ministries of Christ in the world, whether the locale is ghetto or suburb, local parish or hospital, among the rich or poor, the learned or the unlearned. Professionals who minister to the campus share with other ordained ministers the agonies, joys and turmoils of the human situation but in the distinctive setting of the university community.

Ministry on the campus follows the model of the wholeness of the ministry of Christ to the total community. The Danforth Study of campus ministry, *The Church, The University, and Social Policy*, published in 1969, identifies modes of ministry with only slight variation from the traditional church models. In describing the wholeness of ministry the study uses the modes of pastor, priest, prophet, and king: caring for individuals and their needs (pastor); celebrating God's saving work in history (priest); speaking out for justice and a humane social order (prophet); and calling institutions to responsibility for humane administration (king).

This ministry has been shaped by strong local congregations in college communities, campus chaplains, Wesley Foundations, and ecumenical organizations—most recently the United Ministries in Higher Education, the Ministries to Blacks in Higher Education and the National Campus Ministry Association. The United Methodist Church, through its campus ministry, has provided evidence that the church is concerned about the total quality of life, of which education is a part, and about the education of all people. In sponsoring, assisting and supporting ministry in higher education, The United Methodist Church demonstrates an explicit affirmation of the importance of the intellectual life in the love of God and provides an important resource for use by other ministries in other locales.

Higher education is probably the most formative agent in society today. It therefore continues to demand the fullness of ministry. The shape and focus of that ministry is of course always determined by the context in which the church finds itself and the special needs of the institutions that are to be served. A ministry to higher education includes:

Concern for the Community of Faith

Campus ministry gathers a community of faith to seek and witness to

God's will. The forms of Christian community vary from time to time and place to place: a local church, a denominational or ecumenical worship service or celebration, a university chapel. Corporate worship is required for adequate nurture of students and faculty as it is for all Christians.

Concern for Persons

Christian ministry always includes pastoral care. In the face of pressures toward fragmentation in the university, the church's ministry asserts its belief in the essential wholeness of life. By helping people see their lives in terms of the biblical story of God's redemptive work, campus ministries participate in the process of making persons whole. By challenging institutional structures or practices that demean people or deny their full freedom or responsibility, campus ministry demonstrates its commitment to the full dignity that God intends for all people.

Concern for the Freedom of Inquiry

Christians are freed in Christ to be open to all truth and to insist upon freedom of inquiry for all. In the setting of the university, their faith affirms that nothing ultimately threatens their trust in a loving God and an intelligible universe. Christians are also led to a recognition of the relativity of finite knowledge and to criticism of ideologies that claim ultimacy for themselves. Ministry in higher education assists the whole church to recognize the importance of resisting any arbitrary limitations on freedom of inquiry.

Concern for Values

Ministry in higher education makes clear that education involves a process that establishes clarity of meaning and value and thus assists in making the moral decisions of life. Campus ministry seeks to examine operative values in light of the Christian tradition so that Christian people are enabled to make judgments and take action in the light of their faith. Campus ministry analyzes the values implicit in the organization and administration of society and offers, from a Christian perspective, criticisms on behalf of moral responsiveness.

Concern for Global Perspectives

An effective education breaks the limitations of racial or cultural narrowness or prejudice. Ministry in higher education provides leadership that is representative of the best traditions of the church: truly ecumenical, interracial, intercultural, and integrative of varied groups and traditions. Nothing less than the development of people capable of con-

cern for all humanity will serve the mission of Christ in either the church or higher education.

Faithfulness and Accountability in Campus Ministry

Campus ministry, together with all other institutional forms of ministry, is called to be faithful to the gospel of Christ and accountable to the whole church. In the fulfillment of this role, it must work with the other segments of the church in shaping and implementing the church's programs and priorities. Criteria for assessing the effectiveness of campus ministry can be stated in forms in which both faithfulness and accountability are clearly understood, even though they are never clearly separated. Objectives for developing such criteria should include the following:

- Witnessing to faith in Jesus Christ both explicitly and implicitly in the communities of learning.
- Expressing the wholeness of ministry through the several modes of ministry understood by the church.
- Equipping the faithful for the whole work of ministry within the academic community.
- Developing global perspectives in order to extend the life of faith beyond cultural and national limitations as well as to help focus the expertise of the university on the needs of all the peoples of the world.
- Making available to the churches the intellectual resources of higher education and apprising them of relevant developments in higher education.
- Establishing and maintaining clear lines of communication with the church at every appropriate level.
- Bringing the distinctive insights and resources of The United Methodist Church to appropriate ecumenical enterprises and learning from them.
- Expressing in the church the significance and importance of the universities in the quest for the intellectual love of God.

If such standards are achieved, the result will be both an effective and faithful campus ministry. The United Methodist Church will then be better informed about, more fully involved in, and more deeply committed to its responsibility to support ministry in higher education.

New Directions

Campus ministry must continue to be responsive to the distinctive and emerging needs of higher education. The unlimited nature of the task requires campus ministers as well as local pastors to place more emphasis on the ministry by others. Strategies and programs for the future include some of the following:

Ministry in a Learning Society

Ministry in higher education is addressed to complicated institutions that serve a wide range of ages and backgrounds. In fact, virtually everyone in our society is engaged in some form of learning. Ministry in higher education can no longer be limited to a particular age and place, but must be patterned constructively on the basis of new situations.

Ministry in a Pluralistic Society

Committed to the positive value of theological, racial and ethnic pluralism, the United Methodist campus ministry is in a strong position, along with those with whom it characteristically finds itself in partnership, to enter dialogue with groups of evangelicals, charismatics, and Roman Catholics, as well as to continue the historical involvement of campus ministry with those in the Jewish and other religious traditions.

Ministry to Community Colleges

Community colleges have a special role in serving persons now becoming more involved in higher education: students beyond the traditional 18-24 age group and those who have not heretofore had access to higher education because of economic or other barriers. To minister effectively to the large number of community colleges requires the co-operation of churches near the institutions and the development of new models.

Ministry Involving Laity and Local Congregations

Ministry in higher education is located at the intersections of two major social institutions: the church and the university. In partnership with

the specialized ministries in higher education, e.g., Wesley Foundations and United Ministries in Higher Education, the churches near the campuses also have a special mission in higher education. In addition, engagement of the whole church in ministry in higher education means that the ministry of the laity—as teachers, as students, as administrators, as citizens—must be so enabled that God may be served in higher education through the general ministry.

New Patterns of Staffing

As new directions and roles emerge, some campus ministers may serve as faculty or staff of an institution, serve on the staff of a local church, or have other employment that makes possible part-time engagement in specialized ministry. Paraprofessionals, seminary interns, peer group counselors, and volunteer staff will also be more widely used. Staff time will be multiplied many times by involvement of such persons.

New Financial Support

As churches both locally and in conferences become more aware of the faithfulness and accountability of campus ministry and of the new directions of that ministry, new patterns of support should be provided for chaplains at United Methodist institutions and for ministries in independent and state institutions.

Conclusion

The presence of The United Methodist Church in higher education is required by its understanding of ministry. With other segments of the church, The United Methodist Church is called upon by the Gospel to address the Word of God to the whole of higher education. Thus, the United Methodist Church is present in institutions of higher education to call people to the Lordship of Christ; to encourage teaching and scholarship that is both intellectually rigorous and humane; to be prophetic in holding institutions accountable for humane values; to help institutions fulfill their mission to people; to gather a community of the faithful; and to help people within the university anticipate and work for a better society. For all these reasons, The United Methodist Church should continue and strengthen, with faithfulness and imagination, the witness of its campus ministry in higher education.

Churchwide Support for Campus Ministries

Whereas, United Methodist ministry in higher education is manifested through church-related institutions and through ministries in independent and state institutions; and

Whereas, The United Methodist Church must provide ministry to its young people; and

Whereas, a majority of young people of the church who are enrolled in institutions of higher education are enrolled in non-United Methodist related institutions; and

Whereas, the church affirms the principle that it must relate to the life of the students, faculty, and administrators in independent and state institutions; and

Whereas, The United Methodist Church was a pioneer in campus ministry work; and

Whereas, campus ministry helps the whole church approach creatively and critically the functions of institutions of higher education; and

Whereas, campus ministry works with leaders in institutions of higher education toward an understanding of the problems of acting faithfully and ethically; and

Whereas, the United Methodist ministry on the campuses needs reaffirmation of church support and concern:

Therefore, Be It Resolved, that the General Conference reaffirm its 1968 Resolution on Support for Higher Education; and

Be It Further Resolved, that the General Conference and Annual Conferences of The United Methodist Church are encouraged to reaffirm their effort to nurture, preserve, and enhance their campus ministries.

Analysis of Survey of United Methodist Campus Ministers

In the fall of 1976 the National Commission on United Methodist Higher Education conducted a survey of United Methodist campus ministers. The purpose of the survey was twofold: to obtain information about the purpose, activities, and organization of the campus ministries in which United Methodist ministers work; and to learn the views of those ministers concerning both their current operations and their aspirations for campus ministry. The analyses of responses to that survey are reported here.

T. Michael Elliott
Renée G. Loeffler
Kent M. Weeks
Diane Dillard

PART TWO



1. Campus Ministers: Personal Backgrounds and Careers

The typical United Methodist campus minister, based on the responses to the survey, is a white married male, in his forties, a seminary graduate who has spent less than ten years in campus ministry and three years or less in his current position. Such a profile masks, however, the considerable variations in background and personal characteristics actually found among the 222 respondents to the survey.¹ While most were in their thirties or forties, 7% were under 30 and 15% were 50 or older. Nine percent were female, a higher proportion than found in ministry in general, 8% divorced, and 7% single. Seven percent were non-white. Four percent were not seminary graduates, and 5% were not ordained. Almost half had earned graduate degrees in fields other than theology—25% Master's degrees and 18% doctorates. In addition, 35% had advanced training in theological studies. The number of years spent in campus ministry varied greatly. While almost 30% had worked in campus ministry for three years or less, almost 10% had done so for 20 years or more. Fifty-eight percent had spent five years or less in their current position, but almost 18% had spent 10 or more years in the same job.²

The 222 respondents were divided into four groups, based on the kind of campus ministry position they occupied: (1) chaplains hired by and responsible to the institutions in which they work; (2) Wesley Foundation directors appointed by annual conferences; (3) participants in ecumenical ministries responsible to an interdenominational organization, generally United Ministries in Higher Education; and (4) those in other types of positions, including local church staff members spending some of their time in campus ministry and individuals whose primary occupation was not ministry but who spent a portion of their time as campus ministers. The personal characteristics of the ministers in these four kinds of positions varied somewhat. Campus ministers in the fourth, "other," type of position were far more racially diverse than the re-

¹ For a detailed presentation of data on the distribution and return of the surveys, see Appendix Table A.1.

² For a more detailed presentation of the data on the personal characteristics of campus ministers who responded to the survey, see Appendix Tables A.2 to A.7.

spondents as a whole, 18% of them being non-white. Ministers in that group, along with the chaplains, were also the most highly educated. They more often had advanced graduate training in theological studies and graduate degrees in other fields. Indeed, 38% of the chaplains and 45% of the "others" had earned doctorates, compared with 7% of the Wesley Foundation ministers and 12% of those in ecumenical ministries. The high percentage of doctorates among the chaplains no doubt reflects the fact that many of them also teach in the colleges with which they are affiliated.

Professional Career

Just over half the campus ministers worked as pastors immediately before their entry into campus ministry; 17% were students; and the remainder were engaged in other kinds of work. Movement from the pastorate into campus ministry was found most often among Wesley Foundation directors (68%) and least often among those in ecumenical ministries (44%). In contrast, movement into campus ministry from an educational setting—either as a student or as one engaged in educational

TABLE 1. OCCUPATION IMMEDIATELY BEFORE ENTRY INTO CAMPUS MINISTRY, BY TYPE OF POSITION

	Chaplains.	Wesley Foundation Directors	Ecumenical Ministers	All Respondents
Pastor	48.8%	67.6%	44.4%	54.1%
Student	15.6	14.0	27.0	17.1
Educational work	6.7	2.3	9.5	6.7
Other	11.1	10.5	9.5	9.9
Combinations	6.7	7.0	6.4	6.7
No Response	11.1	4.6	3.2	5.5
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Number	45	86	63	222*

* In this and subsequent tables grouping the respondents by type of position, the total number of "All Respondents" exceeds the sum of the respondents in the three types of positions. This difference occurs because the "All Respondents" category includes all who answered the survey, but six of the 222 did not include the kind of position they held, and data on the 22 in "other" types of positions are not presented in the breakdown by position because the diversity of their situations does not make them a sufficiently cohesive group for analytic purposes.

work—was found most often among those in ecumenical ministries (36%) and least often among Wesley Foundation directors (16%).³

There are many reasons why an individual might enter campus ministry. The participants in the survey were given a list of seven possible reasons and were asked to rank them according to their importance in that initial decision. They were instructed not to rank any reason that did not apply in their own case.

A sense of mission or calling was clearly the single most important reason for entering campus ministry. Just over 40% of the ministers who responded to this question cited it as the most important reason in their individual cases and 80% indicated that it was one of the reasons they became campus ministers. Three other reasons were cited by at least 80% of the respondents as having influenced their decision: a desire to work with young people; the stimulation of an academic setting; and the opportunity for personal fulfillment. Fewer than 3% indicated a "negative" reason—such as desire for freedom from parish-type constraints and frustration with other forms of ministry—as the most important factor in their decisions. However, 44% did cite freedom

TABLE 2. REASONS REPORTED FOR ENTERING CAMPUS MINISTRY*

	Percent Selecting As Most Important Reason	Percent Selecting As A Reason
Sense of mission/calling	40.1%	81.2%
Desire to work with young people	14.6	81.8
Stimulation of academic setting	14.1	84.9
Opportunity for personal fulfillment	13.5	82.8
Influence of a person	6.2	47.4
Freedom from parish type constraints	1.6	44.3
Frustration with other forms of ministry	1.0	28.6
Other reasons	8.9	15.6
Total	100.0%	
Number	192	

* Non-respondents excluded.

³ Because of their small number, 22, and diverse situations, the respondents in the "other" types of positions are not included in this or subsequent analyses by type of position.

from parish restraints and 29% reported frustration with other forms of ministry as among their reasons.

Campus ministers occupying different types of positions varied somewhat in their reasons for entering campus ministry. A sense of mission or calling was the most important reason among the members of each group. The degree of importance varied, however, with 44% of ministers in ecumenical positions, 41% of chaplains and 35% of Wesley Foundation directors reporting it as their most important reason. The stimulation of an academic setting was particularly important to chaplains, many of whom also teach, with 27% ranking it as their most important reason. Ministers in ecumenical settings were particularly attracted by the opportunity to work with young people (19%). Despite these variations the basic pattern was very similar among all groups with a sense of mission, a desire to work with young people, the stimulation of an academic setting, and the opportunity for personal fulfillment being the most important reasons for entering into campus ministry. Only a small percentage in each of the groups ranked negative factors, such as frustration with other forms of ministry, as of primary importance in their decision to enter campus ministry.

The 95% of the respondents who are ordained were all presumably members of annual conferences and thus had to receive annual con-

TABLE 3. MOST IMPORTANT REASON FOR ENTERING CAMPUS MINISTRY, BY TYPE OF POSITION*

	Chaplains	Wesley Foundation Directors	Ecumenical Ministers
Sense of mission/calling	40.6%	34.6%	44.1%
Desire to work with young people	8.1	14.7	18.6
Stimulation of academic setting	27.0	13.3	8.5
Opportunity for personal fulfillment	13.5	14.7	13.5
Influence of a person	5.4	6.7	6.8
Freedom from parish type constraints	0.0	2.7	1.7
Frustration with other forms of ministry	0.0	1.3	1.7
Other	5.4	12.0	5.1
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Number	37	75	59

* Non-respondents excluded.

ference appointments to their campus ministry positions. The relative role of the annual conference in the actual recruitment process can vary greatly, however, from a direct annual conference appointment to ratification by the conference of recruitment decisions made largely by others. The respondents were asked what means they had used to secure their current appointment. Among the group as a whole, annual conference appointment processes were the means most often used, followed by personal contacts. Over 60% of the Wesley Foundation directors were selected primarily through annual conference appointment processes. Chaplains used personal contacts more than any other means (43%). Ministers in ecumenical positions relied more on the personnel placement process of United Ministries in Higher Education (32%) than on any other single means, but annual conference processes and personal contacts were also important.

There was considerable variation in the length of time that the ministers wished to remain in campus ministry. Among the group as a whole, a third indicated a desire to continue in the campus ministry for the remainder of their careers, but just under half were uncertain of how long they wished to remain in that field of ministry. Wesley Foundation directors were the group most often reporting they were uncertain (50%) and least often reporting a desire to remain in campus ministry

TABLE 4. MEANS USED TO SECURE CURRENT POSITION, BY TYPE OF POSITION

	Chaplains	Wesley Foundation Directors	Ecumenical Ministers	All Respondents*
Annual Conference appointment processes	15.5%	59.3%	25.4%	38.3%
Personal contacts	40.0	12.8	25.4	23.0
UMHE personnel placement	6.7	3.5	31.7	12.2
Other means	22.2	4.7	3.2	9.0
Combination	8.9	17.4	9.5	13.1
No response	6.7	2.3	4.8	4.5
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Number	45	86	63	222

* Includes respondents who did not indicate type of position and those occupying positions other than the three types shown in the table.

Note: Columns may not add to 100.0% due to rounding.

for the rest of their careers (24%). Ministers in ecumenical positions, on the other hand, were the group least often reporting uncertainty (36%) and most often indicating a desire to remain in campus ministry for the rest of their careers (46%). If the responses to this question are indicative of general satisfaction with campus ministry as a career, it would appear that ecumenical campus ministers are the most satisfied and Wesley Foundation directors the least satisfied. If the responses are viewed as an indication of the degree of professional commitment to campus ministry as a specialized ministry, it appears that Wesley Foundation directors are the least and ecumenical campus ministers the most committed to campus ministry careers.

The respondents were asked whether they thought campus ministers feel "locked in" to that field of ministry because of difficulty in moving into other areas of ministry. A large majority rejected this notion. Nine out of ten said that campus ministers continue to work in that field largely because they want to, and almost three-quarters reported that if they wish to, campus ministers can make a good exit into other forms of ministry or into a secular career.

The respondents were asked to identify the major source of their professional peer relationships. They identified a number of sources with no one source predominant. Among campus ministers as a whole, a

TABLE 5. LENGTH OF TIME CAMPUS MINISTERS REPORTED WISHING TO REMAIN IN CAMPUS MINISTRY, BY TYPE OF POSITION

	All Respon- dents*	Chaplains	Wesley Foundation Directors	Ecumenical Ministers
Remainder of career	32.9%	37.8%	24.4%	46.0%
Short time (less than 5 years)	15.3	11.1	19.8	12.7
Want out immediately	1.4	2.2	0.0	3.2
Uncertain	44.1	40.0	50.0	36.5
Other	2.3	4.4	3.5	0.0
No response	4.1	4.4	2.3	1.6
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Number	222	45	86	63

* Includes respondents who did not indicate type of position and those occupying positions other than the three types shown in the table.

Note: Columns may not add to 100.0% due to rounding.

quarter found their professional relationships primarily in the institution with which their ministry was affiliated. Fifteen percent looked to annual conferences, 15% to other campus ministers, and over a quarter to various combinations of groups.

Somewhat distinctive patterns on this question emerged when the ministers were classified in terms of the type of position occupied. Over half the chaplains, far more than any other group, reported the institution in which they worked as the primary locus of professional relationships. Few cited either the annual conference or other campus ministers. Wesley Foundation directors looked to their annual conference more than did other ministers, but more of them turned to combinations of groups than to the annual conference alone. Among those working in ecumenical ministries, no one group predominated.

The relatively low importance of the annual conference as a primary source of professional peers for campus ministers raises questions concerning the general relationship between the campus ministers and their annual conferences. One explanation for the responses displayed in Table 6 might be that the nature of the work the campus ministers do naturally leads many of them into close involvement with groups other

TABLE 6. PRIMARY SOURCE OF PROFESSIONAL PEER RELATIONSHIPS, BY TYPE OF POSITION

	All Respon- dents*	Chaplains	Wesley Foundation Directors	Ecumenical Ministers
Annual Conference	14.9%	8.9%	24.4%	6.4%
Institution with which affiliated	25.7	55.6	11.6	19.0
Other campus ministers	14.9	8.9	14.0	22.2
Other, including ecumenical groups	11.3	0.0	9.3	22.2
Combinations	27.9	20.0	38.4	23.8
No response	5.4	6.7	2.3	6.3
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Number	222	45	86	63

* Includes respondents who did not indicate type of position and those occupying positions other than the three types shown in the table.

Note: Columns may not add to 100.0% due to rounding.

than the annual conference and thus diminishes the relative importance of the annual conference as a source of professional relationships. On the other hand, it is possible that they tend to turn elsewhere for those relationships because being in a special appointment results in a feeling of alienation or isolation from the annual conference.⁴ Most campus ministers did not report such feelings, however. Those in special appointments were asked to describe in one word their feeling about being in such an appointment. Just over 50% indicated positive feelings, about 10% neutral feelings, and 27% negative feelings such as isolation, frustration, and alienation; 13% did not respond. Reactions varied somewhat among ministers in different types of positions. Negative feelings were expressed least often by Wesley Foundation directors. The closer ties between them and their annual conferences were revealed in answers to two other questions. Asked whether they had adequate opportunity to become involved in annual conference activities, 88% of the Wesley Foundation directors said that they did, compared to 65% to 75% of the other respondents. A higher proportion of Wesley Foundation directors also reported having been actively involved in annual

TABLE 7. RESPONDENTS' FEELINGS ABOUT BEING IN A SPECIAL APPOINTMENT, BY TYPE OF POSITION

	All Respon- dents*	Chaplains	Wesley Foundation Directors	Ecumenical Ministers
Positive, satisfied	50.9%	53.3%	53.5%	52.4%
Neutral, okay	9.5	6.7	12.8	7.9
Uncomfortable, isolated	22.5	24.5	17.4	27.0
Frustrated, alienated	4.1	2.2	4.7	3.2
No response	13.0	13.3	11.6	9.5
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Number	222	45	86	63

* Includes respondents who did not indicate type of position and those occupying positions other than the three types shown in the table.

⁴ A special appointment is an appointment other than a regular pastoral or parish appointment within the conference. Examples, in addition to campus ministry, are: chaplains in hospitals, prisons and the military; faculty and administrators in educational institutions other than United Methodist schools of theology; missionaries related to the Board of Global Ministries, etc. (*The Book of Discipline of The United Methodist Church*, 1976, par. 454.1b.)

conference activities during the preceding year. These differences may result from the responsibilities of chaplains and ecumenical ministers to groups in addition to the annual conference, institutional and ecumenical groups, for instance.

Institutional Affiliation

Campus ministers work in varied institutional settings. While most respondents worked at a single educational institution, 16% worked at more than one. Just over half were in state colleges and universities, a fifth in United Methodist-related institutions, and the remainder in other independent institutions, community colleges, and combinations of institutional type—primarily state and community colleges. Almost all the chaplains worked in United Methodist-related institutions, but a few were in other independent institutions and one in a community college. Wesley Foundation directors and those working in ecumenical ministries were located primarily in state colleges and universities.

There was also substantial variation in the size of the institutions served by the campus ministers. Chaplains were highly concentrated in small institutions with fewer than 2,000 students, but fewer than 5% of

TABLE 8. TYPE OF HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTION, BY TYPE OF CAMPUS MINISTRY POSITION

	All Respon- dents*	Chaplains	Wesley Foundation Directors	Ecumenical Ministers
State college/university	53.2%	0.0%	74.4%	69.8%
Community college	2.7	2.2	3.5	1.6
United Methodist college	21.6	88.9	0.0	3.2
Other church-related	0.9	2.2	0.0	0.0
Independent non-church	5.0	6.7	3.5	4.8
Combination	12.2	0.0	12.8	15.9
No response	4.5	0.0	5.6	4.8
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Number	222	45	86	63

* Includes respondents who did not indicate type of position and those occupying positions other than the three types shown in the table.

Note: Columns may not add to 100.0% due to rounding.

TABLE 9. ENROLLMENTS IN HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS SERVED BY CAMPUS MINISTERS, BY TYPE OF POSITION

	All Respon- dents*	Chaplains	Wesley Foundation Directors	Ecumenical Ministers
Less than 2,000	18.0%	60.0%	2.3%	4.8%
2,000- 9,999	25.7	20.0	33.7	23.8
10,000-19,999	18.9	2.2	26.7	23.8
20,000 or more	23.0	4.4	23.3	31.7
No response	14.4	13.4	14.0	15.9
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Number	222	45	86	63

* Includes respondents who did not indicate type of position and those occupying positions other than the three types shown in the table.

those working in Wesley Foundations or ecumenical ministries worked in such small institutions. From a quarter to a third of the non-chaplains worked in very large institutions with 20,000 or more students.

Summary

These data reveal substantial differences in the backgrounds, career patterns, and institutional settings of campus ministers. Chaplains tend to have high levels of formal education, often with earned doctorates in non-theological fields, to have been attracted to campus ministry by the stimulation of an academic setting—in addition to a sense of mission or calling—to have obtained their campus ministry position through personal contacts, to work in small church-related institutions, and to look primarily to others in their institutions for their professional relationships. Over three-quarters of them, compared with 27% of the Wesley Foundation Directors and 38% of the ecumenical ministers, teach courses at their institutions.

Wesley Foundation directors tend to be pastors who are assigned to campus ministry through the normal annual conference appointment processes. Compared to other campus ministers, they less often reported a sense of mission or calling as their primary reason for entering campus ministry and more often wished to remain in campus ministry for only a short time. They tended to look to the annual conference as

their professional peer group, expressed the least dissatisfaction with being in a special appointment, and were more involved in annual conference activities than other campus ministers. Typically, they worked in large state institutions.

Ecumenical ministers, more often than others, were recruited to their positions through the placement processes of United Ministries in Higher Education. More than others, they cited a sense of mission or calling as their primary reason for entering campus ministry and expressed a desire to remain in campus ministry for the remainder of their careers. They tended to look to a variety of groups for their primary peer relationships and most often worked in large state institutions.

2. Campus Ministry Goals and Programs

The most interesting questions about campus ministry concern the actual programs and goals of that ministry and the aspirations of campus ministers for their ministry. In order to obtain more detailed information about what current United Methodist campus ministers are doing and would like to do, the ministers surveyed were asked to evaluate a list of 53 statements. The statements were divided into three types: 15 related to the general purposes and mission of campus ministry; 28 related to specific functions of campus ministry; and 10 related to administrative and organizational activities. The respondents were asked three questions about each goal, function or activity: (1) how important it actually was in their current campus ministry program; (2) how important they thought it ought to be; and (3) how important, in their opinion, their United Methodist constituency considered it to be. The ministers rated each item on a five point scale ranging from extremely high importance—a rating of 1—to no importance—a rating of 5.

The mean responses of the campus ministers to the 15 purpose and mission statements are displayed in Table 10. The column labeled "Now" shows the mean responses to the question of how important that goal is in their current campus ministry program. The column labeled "Ought" shows responses to the question of how important it ought to be, and the "Constituency" column shows the ministers' perception of its importance to their constituency. The statements are arranged in the order of the means for the "Now" category, beginning with the purpose accorded the greatest importance (lowest mean value).

TABLE 10. MEAN RESPONSES OF CAMPUS MINISTERS WHEN ASSIGNING IMPORTANCE TO CAMPUS MINISTRY PURPOSE AND MISSION STATEMENTS*

	Now†	Ought‡	Constituency§
1. To provide a caring presence for persons in higher education.	1.56	1.40	1.88
2. To relate the Christian gospel to issues of concern in the academic community and in the world.	1.80	1.39	2.44
3. To assist persons in their search for religious identity.	1.83	1.54	1.73
4. To be the church on campus.	2.11	1.94	2.01

TABLE 10. (Continued)

	Now†	Ought‡	Constituency§
5. To advocate humane and meaningful change through the structures of the college/university.	2.34	1.83	3.04
6. To witness to the Christian gospel among competing faiths and ideologies in the academic community.	2.39	2.09	2.02
7. To direct ministries toward women and ethnic minorities.	2.48	2.01	3.11
8. To provide opportunities for study in Christian doctrine, religious beliefs, and church (denominational) polity.	2.60	2.26	2.16
9. To further an understanding of liberation theology, and the social phenomena of racism and sexism.	2.71	2.11	3.50
10. To develop ministries for dealing with changing and alternate life styles.	2.74	2.16	3.41
11. To increase the international awareness of students and faculty.	2.87	2.20	3.42
12. To develop the concept of "morality of knowledge" as a useful concept for critical inquiry into the nature and purpose of the college/university.	2.89	2.07	3.37
13. To provide the college/university community with theological resources for the discussion of teaching-learning dilemmas.	2.95	2.14	3.27
14. To carry out on campus what local churches are attempting in their ministry in the community.	3.10	2.98	2.58
15. To focus on personal ministries for drug abusers, homosexuals, and other groups in special circumstances.	3.14	2.49	3.62

* Means were computed using a scale from 1-5, non-responses excluded. The scale values were: 1—extremely high importance, 2—high importance; 3—medium importance; 4—low importance; 5—no importance or not applicable.

† Now: Importance in the current program of the individual campus ministry.

‡ Ought: Importance it should have, in the belief of the respondent, in the campus ministry program.

§ Constituency: The respondents' perceptions of the importance their United Methodist constituency would assign to this item.

The survey responses show that United Methodist campus ministers consider all of these purposes to be important, both in their current ministries and in what they would consider an ideal campus ministry program. Even the two lowest rated items were evaluated as of medium

importance in current programs and of medium-high importance in an ideal program. The three most important purposes, both in current campus ministry programs and in the aspirations of the respondents for their ministries, were: to provide a caring presence for persons in higher education; to relate the Christian gospel to issues of concern in the academic community and in the world; and to assist persons in their search for religious identity. The two statements assigned the lowest degree of importance, in both current programs and aspirations, were to carry out on campus the programs local churches seek to carry out in the community and to focus on personal ministries for drug abusers, homosexuals, and others in special need.

The campus ministers appear to have very high aspirations for their ministries. Every item received a higher rating for the importance it should have than for the importance it does have. Furthermore, except for the two lowest rated statements, each one was rated as of at least "high importance" in an ideal campus ministry program.

In addition to reporting on their own views and activities, the respondents were asked to estimate the degree of importance that their United Methodist constituency would assign to each of the purposes. The survey instructions did not define the composition of their constituency but left the respondents free to make that judgment on the basis of their particular situation. In the discussion of the "constituency" responses, it is important to note that *the data represent only the opinions of the campus ministers, not actual constituent responses*. Thus they should not be taken as indicative of the opinions of those constituents but as measures of the degree of congruency that the campus ministers feel between their own views and those they believe to be held by their constituents. The ministers' perceptions of constituency views are not based on uninformed guesses, however, since most campus ministers have considerable opportunity to become acquainted with constituency opinions.

In general, campus ministers believe their constituents would place highest importance on pastoral activities and would give less importance than do the ministers to purposes associated with issues of social change and justice. The ministers believe that two of the three statements they rated most highly—providing a caring presence for persons and assisting them in their search for religious identity (items 1 and 3)—would be the two rated highest by the constituency. The purpose which the ministers rated second in their current programs and first in

their aspirations—relating the Christian gospel to issues of concern in the academic community and the world (item 2)—was believed to have considerably less support among members of the constituency. Three other, more traditional pastoral roles were regarded as more important to constituents than that one: to be the church on campus, to witness to the Christian gospel among competing faiths and ideologies, and to provide opportunities for studying Christian doctrine, religious beliefs and church polity (items 4, 6 and 8). The goals which they believed had the least support among their constituents dealt with problems of social change or justice or with the intellectual work of campus ministry; to focus on personal ministries to those with special needs, such as drug abusers and homosexuals; to further an understanding of liberation theology and the social phenomena of racism and sexism; to increase the international awareness of students and faculty; and to develop ministries for dealing with changing and alternate lifestyles (items 15, 9, 11 and 10). While three of these four were rated by the ministers as highly important in what campus ministry should be doing, they believed their constituents would rate them as of medium-low importance.

In summary, campus ministers believe their constituents would have them emphasize pastoral goals such as witness and the religious nurturing of students and would de-emphasize social criticism, ministry to socially ostracized groups, and attention to issues of racism and sexism. Whether these beliefs are accurate is unknown. What is clear, however, is that the ministers believe a gap exists between their views and those of their constituents. There may be a need for more communication and interaction between campus ministers and their constituents to determine the accuracy of these perceptions and to exchange views about what campus ministry is and should be.

Responses to the purpose and mission statements revealed little difference in orientation among ministers in different types of campus ministry positions. There was only one purpose and mission statement for which the differences in their responses were statistically significant. In responding to the question of how important it is in their current campus ministry programs to advocate humane and meaningful change through the structures of the college/university, ecumenical ministers and chaplains reported that purpose to be of high importance in their current programs while Wesley Foundation directors said it was of medium high importance.⁵ Clearly, the general pattern suggested by

⁵ The mean responses to that statement were: ecumenical ministers, 2.05; chaplains, 2.21; and Wesley Foundation directors, 2.62.

the ministers' responses is that despite considerable differences in their particular working environments, the three groups of campus ministers have very similar views with respect to their basic purpose and mission.

Functions

The campus ministers evaluated 28 statements of possible campus ministry functions. The general pattern of their responses to these items was quite similar to those given to the more general purpose and mission statements. A comparison of the "now" and "ought" columns in Table 11 shows that campus ministers generally felt that the relative importance given to specific functions in their current ministries was close to the relative importance they ought to have. In each case, though, importance in current activities was somewhat lower than the respon-

TABLE 11. MEAN RESPONSES OF CAMPUS MINISTERS WHEN ASSIGNING IMPORTANCE TO CAMPUS MINISTRY FUNCTION STATEMENTS*

	Now	Ought	Constituency
1. To provide pastoral counseling.	1.81	1.70	1.80
2. To provide a ministry for all persons on campus.	2.21	1.90	2.50
3. To be recognized by the academic community as having useful resources and leadership skills.	2.26	1.83	2.59
4. To provide for a worshipping community on campus.	2.28	2.02	2.08
5. To help interrelate the resources of university, community, and churches for specific activities.	2.30	1.84	2.69
6. To provide opportunities for students to explore and discuss sexuality, male-female roles, etc.	2.41	1.94	3.08
7. To be aware of the issues raised in various communication organs on campus.	2.45	2.11	3.21
8. To identify and nurture pre-theological students.	2.46	2.14	2.15
9. To initiate and nurture discussions among people in higher education, the church, and the community on issues of common concern.	2.51	1.93	2.84
10. To organize groups for study and action upon special concerns and problems raised in the college/university.	2.52	1.95	3.03
11. To supplement opportunities for career and vocational counseling on the campus.	2.64	2.27	2.85

TABLE 11. (Continued)

	Now	Ought	Constituency
12. To acquaint students, faculty, and administrators with local church opportunities.	2.73	2.44	2.32
13. To assist local churches to understand and become involved in issues of higher education.	2.81	2.22	3.15
14. To facilitate ministries to dorm students.	2.92	2.37	2.47
15. To assist local churches in their ministries with young adults.	2.54	2.50	2.77
16. To develop newsletters and other media for interpretation of campus ministry to the campus community and in local churches.	2.98	2.29	2.70
17. To establish resources for emergency aid, scholarships, and short-term loans for students.	3.13	2.78	3.24
18. To provide opportunities for creative use of leisure time in campus communities.	3.18	2.79	3.14
19. To work closely with continuing education facilities to make them responsive to community needs.	3.35	2.80	3.51
20. To care primarily for United Methodist students on campus.	3.38	3.32	2.42
21. To involve students in an intercollegiate Christian movement.	3.59	2.95	3.12
22. To assist local churches to formulate goals dealing with community needs.	3.74	3.14	3.82
23. To organize evangelistic programs on campus.	3.78	3.45	2.69
24. To develop strategies for impacting state legislatures with church concerns in public higher education.	3.83	2.93	4.01
25. To move toward area ministries serving more than one campus.	3.85	3.48	3.85
26. To design and implement student opinion surveys regarding events and problems impacting the college/university.	3.91	3.35	3.96
27. To help define the nature and unique possibilities of community colleges.	3.98	3.44	3.47
28. To protect students from atheistic and secular influences on campus.	4.14	4.10	2.80

* See Table 10 for an explanation of terminology and methodology.

dents thought it should be. Campus ministers appear to feel that their ministries should be doing more in all areas.

A comparison between the "ought" and "constituency" columns reveals that the ministers rated pastoral counseling as the most important function of their ministry and believed that their constituents would also rate it first in importance. Beyond that, they believed there were some differences between their priorities and those of their constituents. These differences can be seen more clearly in Table 12 which shows the five functions the ministers thought should be most important in their ministries (ought) and the five they believed their constituents would rank most highly (constituency). As noted, the provision of pastoral counseling ranked first on both lists. The remaining items are different on the two lists, not only with respect to the specific items but also the general nature of the items. Three of the functions given highest priority by the ministers themselves relate to the specific setting of campus ministry in the academic community: to be recognized by the academic community as having useful resources and leadership skills; to help interrelate the resources of university, community, and churches for specific activities; and to initiate and nurture discussions among people in higher education, the church, and the community on issues of common concern. In contrast, the ministers believed that their constituents would give priority to more traditional, church oriented elements of their ministry: to provide for a worshipping community on campus; to identify and nurture pre-theological students; and to acquaint students, faculty, and administrators with local church opportunities. Further contrast between the ministers' own views and those ascribed to their constituents is seen in the items rated fourth in the "ought" and fifth in the "constituency" columns. The ministers believed that they should "provide a ministry for all persons on campus." In their opinion, their constituents would instead have them "care primarily for *United Methodist* students on campus."

These responses suggest that the ministers believe their primary functions, beyond pastoral counseling, should reflect the special locale of their ministry in the academic community and the interaction between the university and the rest of society. They would emphasize actively involving their ministries as resources and catalysts in study and action on issues involving campus, local community, and the broader society. This position might be characterized as issue oriented, with an emphasis on prophetic and governance modes of ministry. On the other hand, they believe their *United Methodist* constituents would have them empha-

TABLE 12. FIVE FUNCTION STATEMENTS RATED AS MOST IMPORTANT IN "OUGHT" AND "CONSTITUENCY" RATINGS, IN RANK ORDER

Campus Ministers' Ratings (Ought)	Constituency Views as Rated by Campus Ministers
1. To provide pastoral counseling. (1.70)	1. To provide pastoral counseling. (1.80)
2. To be recognized by the academic community as having useful resources and leadership skills. (1.83)	2. To provide for a worshipping community on campus. (2.08)
3. To help interrelate the resources of university, community, and churches for specific activities. (1.84)	3. To identify and nurture pre-theological students. (2.15)
4. To provide a ministry for all persons on campus. (1.90)	4. To acquaint students, faculty, and administrators with local church opportunities. (2.32)
5. To initiate and nurture discussions among people in higher education, the church, and the community on issues of common concern. (1.93)	5. To care primarily for United Methodist students on campus. (2.42)

size more specifically denominational and "religious" concerns regarding worship, ministerial recruitment, working with local churches, and caring for United Methodist students.

Unlike the purpose and mission statements, there were a number of instances in which ministers in different types of positions differed with respect to the degree of importance accorded specific functions. Table 13 displays those statements, showing only those for which the differences were statistically significant at the .05 level—that is, the possibility of these differences resulting from chance factors is no more than 5%.

Compared to other campus ministers, chaplains gave somewhat greater emphasis to ministering to all persons on campus, identifying and nurturing pre-theological students, and providing for a worshipping community on campus (items 1, 7, and 10). These emphases probably reflect the chaplain's role as an officer of the institution with the duty to serve the whole campus community and the fact that almost all the chaplains are located at United Methodist-related colleges. Wesley Foundation directors attached greater importance to developing resources for emergencies and other student needs, caring primarily for United Methodist students, and, along with ministers in ecumenical

positions, developing means to interpret campus ministry to the campus community and local churches (items 2, 3, and 9). The relatively greater importance they assign to these functions may reflect the specific denominational orientation of their work and the fact that they tend to work in relatively large institutions which may require more formal communication patterns. Ministers in ecumenical positions gave greater emphasis to developing multi-institutional ministries, helping to define the nature of community colleges, acting as a catalyst among higher education, the church, and the community, and assisting local churches to formulate goals dealing with community needs (items 4, 5, 6, and 8). These emphases are part of the basic commitment and program of United Ministries in Higher Education.

TABLE 13. MEAN RESPONSES TO IMPORTANCE OF FUNCTION STATEMENTS, BY TYPE OF POSITION*

		Chaplain	Wesley Found.	Ecumenical Ministry
1. To provide a ministry for all persons on campus. (2)**	<i>Now</i>	1.71	2.35	2.32
	<i>Ought</i>	1.40	2.01	2.05
2. To establish resources for emergency aid, scholarships, and short-term loans for students. (17)	<i>Now</i>	3.64	2.80	3.08
	<i>Ought</i>	3.33	2.40	2.81
3. To care primarily for United Methodist students on campus. (20)	<i>Now</i>	3.71	2.97	3.75
	<i>Ought</i>	3.70	2.95	3.70
	<i>Constituency</i>	2.81	1.99	2.70
4. To move toward area ministries serving more than one campus. (25)	<i>Now</i>	4.36	3.97	3.38
	<i>Ought</i>	4.11	3.52	3.05
	<i>Constituency</i>	4.36	3.91	3.53
5. To help define the nature and unique possibilities of community colleges. (27)	<i>Now</i>	4.58	4.08	3.60
	<i>Ought</i>	4.35	3.45	2.97
	<i>Constituency</i>	4.74	3.95	3.62
6. To initiate and nurture discussions among people in higher education, the church, and the community on issues of common concern. (9)	<i>Now</i>	2.80	2.67	2.25

TABLE 13. (Continued)

		Chap- lain	Wesley Found.	Ecumen- ical Ministry
7. To identify and nurture pre-theological students. (8)	Now	1.93	2.51	2.70
8. To assist local churches to formulate goals dealing with community needs. (22)	Now	4.09	3.81	3.48
9. To develop newsletters and other media for interpretation of campus ministry to the campus community and in local churches. (16)	Ought	2.72	2.13	2.08
	Constituency	3.19	2.46	2.52
10. To provide for a worshipping community on campus. (4)	Now	1.64	2.33	2.68
	Ought	1.41	2.12	2.37
	Constituency	1.71	2.15	2.22

* For an explanation of terminology and methodology, see Table 10.

** Numbers in parentheses after each statement are the numbers in Table 11 for those items.

Administration and Organization

A third set of statements evaluated by the campus ministers concerned various aspects of the administration and organization of campus ministries. Their overall priorities in the ideal and actual cases were very similar. The ministers did not perceive much variance in this area between their views and those of their constituents. They believed that the *relative* importance their constituents would assign to the various items would be very similar to the relative importance they assigned. In each column in Table 14, for instance, the same items received the five highest and the five lowest ratings. In some cases, there are substantial differences in the actual ratings assigned, with the constituency rating lower in importance in each case. These differences may reflect a belief on the part of the ministers that constituents, relatively unacquainted with the administrative and organizational aspects of campus ministry, would not consider most of these matters to be important.

TABLE 14. MEAN RESPONSES OF CAMPUS MINISTERS WHEN ASSIGNING IMPORTANCE TO CAMPUS MINISTRY ADMINISTRATIVE AND ORGANIZATIONAL STATEMENTS

	Now	Ought	Constituency
1. To operate ministries with the widest possible ecumenical involvement.	2.01	1.75	2.70
2. To engage in systematic planning, budgeting and evaluation procedures.	2.32	2.10	2.48
3. To involve women and minorities in the leadership of campus ministries.	2.33	1.90	2.90
4. To develop support communities for campus ministry staff.	3.06	2.47	3.36
5. To engage in in-depth studies of staff, program and governance structure at intervals of five years.	3.07	2.52	3.39
6. To establish guidelines for continuing education of staff.	3.30	2.69	3.56
7. To search for non-judicatory sources of financial support for special projects.	3.40	3.05	3.53
8. To utilize UMHE regional secretaries for training workshops for staff and board members.	3.79	2.94	3.81
9. To equip professional staff for teaching responsibilities in departments of religion.	3.85	3.44	3.82
10. To convert facilities and property into investment capital for assuring expanded and continued ministry.	4.32	4.02	4.31

There were some differences in responses to the administrative and organizational statements by ministers holding different types of positions (Table 15). Wesley Foundation directors, working in a distinct United Methodist framework, were the least interested in operating with wide ecumenical involvement (item 4); those working in ecumenical ministries naturally assigned very high importance to it, as did chaplains whose role is to serve the whole institutional community. Those in ecumenical ministries also gave greater importance to systematic planning and evaluation (items 1 and 6), to utilizing UMHE regional secretaries for training workshops (item 5), to establishing guidelines for continuing education of staff (item 3), to finding non-judicatory sources of support for special projects (item 2), and to developing support communities for campus ministry staff (item 7).

TABLE 15. MEAN IMPORTANCE ASSIGNED TO ADMINISTRATIVE AND ORGANIZATIONAL ACTIVITIES, BY TYPE OF POSITION

		Chap- lain	Wesley Found.	Ecumen- ical Ministry
1. To engage in in-depth studies of staff, program and governance structure at intervals of five years.	<i>Now</i>	3.55	3.25	2.58
	<i>Ought</i>	2.81	2.62	2.15
2. To search for non-judicatory sources of financial support for special projects.	<i>Now</i>	3.87	3.49	3.06
	<i>Ought</i>	3.73	2.92	2.84
	<i>Constituency</i>	3.96	3.51	3.32
3. To establish guidelines for continuing education of staff.	<i>Now</i>	3.59	3.43	2.83
	<i>Ought</i>	3.21	2.59	2.30
4. To operate ministries with the widest possible ecumenical involvement.	<i>Now</i>	1.86	2.45	1.52
	<i>Ought</i>	1.69	2.06	1.33
5. To utilize UMHE regional secretaries for training workshops for staff and board members.	<i>Now</i>	4.05	3.87	3.42
	<i>Ought</i>	3.36	2.98	2.47
6. To engage in systematic planning, budgeting and evaluation procedures.	<i>Now</i>	2.80	2.31	1.95
	<i>Ought</i>	2.56	2.08	1.75
	<i>Constituency</i>	3.00	2.49	2.13
7. To develop support communities for campus ministry staff.	<i>Now</i>	3.64	2.95	2.76
	<i>Ought</i>	3.16	2.37	2.06

Campus Ministry Modes

In addition to evaluations of the 53 statements of goals, functions and activities, the campus ministers were asked another set of questions about the nature of current and desired campus ministry programs. The questions were posed in terms of the four modes of ministry referred to in the National Commission statement, "The Mission of The United Methodist Church in its Campus Ministry" (*pastoral*—caring for indi-

viduals and their needs; *priestly*—celebrating God's saving work in history; *prophetic*—speaking out for justice in the human social order; and *governance*—calling institutions to responsibility for humane administration). The respondents were asked to indicate the percent of professional staff time which they believed should be allocated to each of the four modes. They were also asked to indicate the actual percent of professional time that was being spent on each of those modes in their current ministry. The results are shown in Tables 16 and 17.

Pastoral care was clearly the first priority both in terms of how campus ministers think they should spend their time and how they actually spend their time. However, a substantial number of campus ministers appear to spend more time on pastoral care than they think they ideally should. While 57% indicated that they thought 40% or more of professional staff time should be spent on pastoral activities, 74% reported spending that much time in their current ministries. In the view of most campus ministers, the second greatest share of time should be spent on prophetic ministry. For many campus ministers, however, actual time spent on prophetic ministry is less than they think it should be. While over three-quarters of the ministers thought they should spend at least 20% of their time working in the prophetic mode, only about half actually devoted that much time to prophetic activities. The *priestly* and *governance* modes ranked third and fourth in the amount of time the ministers believed should be allocated to them. Actual distribution of staff time for these two modes was fairly close to the desired distribution reported by the ministers.

The ideal and actual amounts of staff time devoted to the four modes varied somewhat according to the type of campus ministry position occupied. Those working in ecumenical ministries tended to give greater

TABLE 16. PERCENT OF PROFESSIONAL STAFF TIME THAT SHOULD BE ALLOCATED TO FOUR MODES OF CAMPUS MINISTRY

	Pastoral	Priestly	Prophetic	Governance
Less than 20%	.5%	42.0%	23.6%	48.3%
20-39%	42.2	55.8	68.2	50.0
40-59%	41.5	2.2	7.1	1.7
60% or more	15.8	0.0	1.1	0.0
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Number	183	181	182	178

TABLE 17. PERCENT OF PROFESSIONAL STAFF TIME ACTUALLY ALLOCATED TO FOUR MODES OF CAMPUS MINISTRY

	Pastoral	Priestly	Prophetic	Governance
Less than 20%	2.1%	51.7%	45.9%	52.2%
20-39%	24.2	42.1	48.1	39.3
40-59%	43.3	6.2	5.5	7.9
60% or more	30.4	0.0	.5	.6
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Number	194	178	183	178

emphasis than others to prophetic and governance activities. Chaplains and Wesley Foundation directors, on the other hand, tended to emphasize pastoral and priestly functions.

Campus Ministry Clienteles

In order to measure campus ministry involvement with various clienteles, the ministers were asked the percent of professional staff time allocated to students, faculty and administrators, community residents, local congregations, and other persons. They were also asked the number of persons from each group who were involved in their campus ministry programs. Because a large number of the ministers did not answer these questions, it is impossible to do a reliable analysis of campus ministry clientele. However, three quarters of the chaplains, Wesley Foundation directors, and ecumenical ministers did answer these questions with respect to students, thus providing some reasonably good data on involvement with that group.

Chaplains, working primarily in small institutions, appear to focus their activities more on students than do other campus ministers. Forty-one percent reported spending 80% or more of their time with students and almost 80% spent at least 60% of their time with students. Staff of ecumenical ministries, though still highly involved with students, devoted less of their time to them than did other ministry staff. Only 12% reported spending 80% or more of their time with students while 22% spent less than 40% of their time with them. Wesley Foundation directors fell in the middle, devoting more staff time to students than did ecumenical ministers but less than chaplains. (See Table 18.)

TABLE 18. PERCENT OF PROFESSIONAL STAFF TIME GIVEN TO STUDENTS

	Chaplains	Wesley Foundation Directors	Ecumenical Ministers
Less than 20%	5.9%	1.6%	2.0%
20-39%	2.9	6.2	20.4
40-59%	11.8	28.1	20.4
60-79%	38.2	31.3	45.0
80% or more	41.2	32.8	12.2
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Number	34	64	49

TABLE 19. NUMBER OF STUDENTS INVOLVED IN CAMPUS MINISTRY PROGRAMS

	Chaplains	Wesley Foundation Directors	Ecumenical Ministers
1- 49	8.8%	11.1%	7.1%
50- 99	5.9	16.7	9.5
100-199	17.6	36.0	9.5
200-499	47.1	27.8	31.0
500 or more	20.6	8.4	42.9
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Number	34	72	42

Campus ministry programs run by Wesley Foundation directors tended to be smaller in size, involving fewer students than the programs of chaplains and ecumenical ministers. Almost 28% of the Wesley Foundation directors, compared with about 15% of the chaplains and 17% of the ecumenical ministers, reported fewer than 100 students in their programs. Only 8% of the Wesley Foundations involved 500 or more students, compared with the programs of 21% of the chaplains and 43% of the ecumenical ministers. Ecumenical ministry programs clearly are the largest in size with over two fifths involving 500 or more students. These differences probably reflect the fact that chaplains minister to the whole student body, ecumenical ministers to students from

several denominations and Wesley Foundation directors primarily to United Methodist students alone.

Summary

The first priority of nearly all campus ministers was providing pastoral care. They believed that was also the first priority of their United Methodist constituents. Beyond that common agreement, however, they believed there were some differences between what they and their constituents regarded as important. Generally, the second set of priorities for campus ministers involved the prophetic role of ministry—study and action intended to bring about a more just society. They reported their constituents to be much less interested in the prophetic role and considerably more interested in more traditional church functions of religious witness and nurture.

Campus ministers in all types of positions saw pastoral care as their primary task. Beyond that there were some differences, however, in program orientations of chaplains, Wesley Foundation directors, and ministers working in ecumenical settings. Chaplains, working largely in small church-related institutions, emphasized personal ministry to all persons on campus, ministerial recruitment, and the establishment of a worshipping community. While all three types of campus ministers saw students as their primary clientele, that was especially true of chaplains. Wesley Foundation directors, more closely tied to annual conferences and the institutional church, reported giving greater attention than other campus ministers to developing a specific United Methodist orientation in their ministry. In terms of the number of students involved in their programs, Wesley Foundations tended to be small. Ministers in ecumenical settings emphasized more than others the role of the church as a resource and catalyst in social change and criticism. Compared to other campus ministers they devoted less time to working with students and more to other groups, but their programs nonetheless involved rather large numbers of students.

3. Financing, Staffing, and Governance of Campus Ministries

Financing

Campus ministry budgets are not large. In 1973-74, half of the ministries reporting spent less than \$20,000.⁶ Although campus ministry budgets grew somewhat during the following years so that almost half had budgeted expenditures of from \$20,000-\$50,000 in 1976-77, they still remained on the small side. Only 15% had budgets of \$50,000 or more in 1976-77.

TABLE 20. CAMPUS MINISTRY EXPENDITURES

	1973-74	1975-76	1976-77*
Less than \$20,000	50.0%	43.3%	35.9%
\$20,000-\$49,999	37.5	43.9	49.2
\$50,000-\$99,999	8.9	7.8	11.0
\$100,000 or more	3.6	5.0	3.9
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Number	168	180	181

* Budgeted.

Expenditures reported by campus ministries varied considerably with the type of ministry. Chaplaincies and Wesley Foundations were rather similar in budget size. Just over 40% had budgets of less than \$20,000 in 1976-77, and only about 6% of the chaplains and 10% of the Wesley Foundation directors had budgets of \$50,000 or more. Ecumenical campus ministries, on the other hand, tended to be funded at a considerably higher level. Only 18% had 1976-77 budgets of less than \$20,000 while 31% had budgets of \$50,000 or more. These differences in budget size were in keeping with the larger size of the ecumenical ministry programs as measured by the number of students involved, size of institutions served, and number of staff.

⁶ These and subsequent figures are for those campus ministries that provided financial information. In each of the three years for which it was requested, from 20-25% did not provide the information.

TABLE 21. *CAMPUS MINISTRY EXPENDITURES, BY TYPE OF MINISTRY, 1976-77**

	Chaplaincies	Wesley Foundations	Ecumenical Ministries
Less than \$20,000	42.0%	43.1%	18.2%
\$20,000-\$49,999	51.6	47.2	50.9
\$50,000-\$99,999	3.2	6.9	23.6
\$100,000 or more	3.2	2.8	7.3
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Number	31	72	55

* Budgeted.

Although the campus ministers were asked to provide a breakdown of expenditures by category, a reliable analysis of expenditure patterns was not possible because many did not provide this information. The available data suggest, however, that the bulk of campus ministry funds were used for the support of professional staff and that relatively little money was available for other program support. It was the professional staff itself that was the major resource for campus ministry programs and activities.

The survey responses did not provide enough data to analyze campus ministry income by source. Some data are available, however, regarding support by annual conferences of The United Methodist Church.

Reports from a National Commission survey of annual conference treasurers showed that conference support for campus ministries grew from \$4.4 million in 1972 to almost \$5.5 million in 1975, an increase of 24.9%. Measured in terms of the amount contributed to campus ministry per church member, support increased from 43¢ per member in 1972 to 57¢ in 1975. Support for campus ministry was 22.2% of all annual conference higher education expenditures in 1972.⁷ That percentage dropped a little to 19.8% in 1973 and then rose slightly in the following two years, reaching 20.6% in 1975. Measured as a percent of total benevolences, conference funding of campus ministry remained steady over the four years.

⁷ Included in higher education expenditures are contributions to campus ministry, the Race Relations Day Offering in 1972, the Black College Fund in 1973 and later years, the Ministerial Education Fund, United Methodist colleges and universities, loan and scholarship funds, and miscellaneous higher education activities.

The decline in campus ministry support as a percentage of higher education support is related to the increase in annual conference support for black colleges. Annual conference contributions to black institutions increased by 155.9% between 1972 and 1975.⁸ Annual conference support for all other higher education activities grew by only 24.4% during that period. Thus the 24.9% increase in campus ministry funding was a little higher than the increase in funding for all higher education activities other than support of the black colleges.

The national data for campus ministry support mask considerable variation among the jurisdictions. In 1975, for instance, campus ministry

TABLE 22. ANNUAL CONFERENCE SUPPORT FOR CAMPUS MINISTRY, 1972-1975*

	Amount Given to Campus Ministries	Campus Minis- try Support per Church Member	Campus Minis- try Support As % of Annual Conference Higher Educa- tion Support	Campus Minis- try Support As % of World Service and Annual Confer- ence Benevolences
1972	\$4,384,927	\$.43	22.2%	4.1%
1973	4,715,708	.47	19.8%	4.1%
1974	5,060,852	.51	20.0%	3.9%
1975	5,477,588	.57	20.6%	3.9%

* Operating funds only; contributions to capital expenditures not included.

TABLE 23. SUPPORT FOR CAMPUS MINISTRY BY JURISDICTION, 1975

	Per Church Member	As % of Total Higher Education Support	As % of World Service and Confer- ence Benevolences
North Central	\$.70	26.8%	4.7%
Northeastern	.36	18.0%	2.7%
South Central	.62	21.7%	4.6%
Southeastern	.53	15.7%	3.4%
Western	.72	31.0%	5.1%

⁸ Included in the calculation for 1972 were direct contributions to black institutions and the proceeds of the Race Relations Day Offering. The 1975 figures include direct contributions and the Black College Fund. It should be noted that the total increase in black college support from all church sources was only 64.7%.

contributions per member ranged from a low of 36¢ in the Northeastern Jurisdiction to 72¢ in the Western Jurisdiction. As a percentage of support for higher education, contributions for campus ministry varied from 15.7% in the Southeastern Jurisdiction to 31% in the Western Jurisdiction. As a percent of total World Service and conference benevolences, the range was from 2.7% in the Northeastern to 5.1% in the Western Jurisdiction.

Even within jurisdictions, support patterns varied considerably. In the North Central Jurisdiction in 1975, for instance, support per member was less than 50¢ in two annual conferences, from 50-99¢ in nine conferences, from \$1.00-1.49 in two, and over \$1.50 in one.

The 1968 General Conference adopted a resolution that was reaffirmed by the 1976 General Conference calling for a minimum level of support for campus ministries in the amount of \$.50 per church member. On a national average, that level of giving was exceeded in 1975, but 38 of the annual conferences, 52% of the total, did not achieve that level of support.

Staffing

Most campus ministries have small staffs. Over half the campus ministers reported one full-time professional on the staff of their ministries; 14% reported two full-time professionals; and 10% had three or more.

TABLE 24. CONTRIBUTIONS TO CAMPUS MINISTRIES, PER CHURCH MEMBER BY ANNUAL CONFERENCES WITHIN EACH JURISDICTION, 1975

Amount of Contribution	Total U.S.	North Central Juris.	North-eastern Juris.	South Central Juris.	South-eastern Juris.	Western Juris.
\$.00- .49	52%	14%	94%	35%	59%	43%
\$.50- .99	36	64	6	53	29	29
\$1.00-1.49	9	14	—	12	12	14
\$1.50 or more	3	7	—	—	—	14
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number	73	14	18	17	17	7

Note: Columns may not add to 100.0% due to rounding.

TABLE 25. SIZE OF CAMPUS MINISTRY STAFF

Number of Staff Members	Full-Time Professional	Full-Time Support
None	2.3%	5.9%
One	54.5	17.5
Two	14.4	4.5
Three or more	9.4	3.6
No Response	19.4	68.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%
Number	222	222

Although only 2% reported no full-time professionals, many of those classified in Table 25 as non-respondents may have left the question blank to convey that there were no full-time professionals on the staff. If so, the number without a full-time professional might approach 20%. Assistance from full-time support staff was also limited, only about a quarter of the campus ministers reporting that they had one or more full-time support staff. Ecumenical campus ministries, located primarily at large institutions and often representing the union of several separate denominational programs, clearly had the biggest staffs. Just over half (50.1%) of the ministers in ecumenical positions reported two or more professional staff members in their ministries, compared with 13.3% of the chaplains, and 10.5% of the Wesley Foundation directors.

Data on staff and budget suggest that many campus ministries may be best equipped to function in the pastoral mode, providing attention to the personal needs of students. The larger staff and greater funding of ecumenical ministries suggest more diverse program possibilities, but since they also tend to operate in large institutions and to have larger numbers of students involved in their programs, demands for pastoral care would presumably be higher than in the smaller ministries. Nonetheless, the larger size of their staffs and budgets probably facilitates the greater involvement in non-pastoral activities reported by the ecumenical ministers.

Governance

The governing boards of campus ministries typically have at least ten but fewer than 40 members, meet several times during the year, and

average between ten and 30 persons in attendance at board meetings. The campus ministers were asked to evaluate the adequacy of the pluralistic composition of their boards (men, women, minorities) and the adequacy of the representation of students, institutional persons, and annual conference representatives. A certain amount of dissatisfaction was evident regarding the boards' pluralistic composition. Only 38% fully agreed that their board was adequate in that respect and over 16% totally or partially disagreed. There was greater satisfaction with the participation of students and people from the institutions and annual conferences. Over 60% fully agreed that such representation was adequate and only 10% disagreed. The ministers were also asked whether their boards maintained an active involvement with the judicatory. A little over 40% fully agreed that their board did maintain such an involvement and 13% expressed some disagreement.

The respondents were given a list of six possible governing board roles and were asked to rank the importance of those roles in both the current activities of their governing boards and in the respondents' opinions concerning the appropriate roles of their boards. The rankings indicated that the actual roles of governing boards parallel closely the roles campus ministers consider appropriate (Table 26).

Policy setting was clearly the most important activity of governing boards. Second was evaluation of the ministry in both the actual and the

TABLE 26. MINISTERS' EVALUATION OF GOVERNING BOARDS

	Number of Respon- dents	Percent Choosing Each Response				
		Fully Agree	Partially Agree	Uncer- tain	Partially Disagree	Totally Disagree
The board is adequate in its pluralistic composition (men, women, minorities).	188	38.3%	43.6%	1.6%	12.8%	3.7%
The board is adequate in its representation of students, institutional persons, and annual conference representatives	187	62.0%	25.1%	2.7%	8.6%	1.6%
The board maintains an active involvement with the judicatory.	183	42.1%	38.3%	7.1%	10.4%	2.2%

ideal situations. In the actual activities of the boards, personal counsel to staff was third, followed by interpretation of the ministry. The campus ministers believed, however, that the relative importance of these two roles should be reversed and that more attention should be given to interpretation of ministry. Fund raising and implementation of the ministry's activities were not important roles for governing boards nor did the ministers think they should be.

The respondents were asked whether they felt the processes for goal development, planning, and priority setting had been adequately established in their ministries. Just over half gave a positive answer, a third a negative answer, and the remainder did not respond.

In response to the question concerning to whom campus ministries should be accountable, a variety of views was expressed. The most frequent responses were the annual conference (39%), the institution with which the ministry was affiliated (17%), and groups other than the annual conferences, institutions, general church boards, or local congregations—in most cases, ecumenical agencies (17%). Responses of ministers occupying the same type of campus ministry position tended to be similar, reflecting no doubt the fact that each group has similar accountability patterns. The chaplains identified the institutions with which their campus ministry was affiliated as the primary group to whom they should be accountable (53%). Wesley Foundation directors chose the annual conference (63%). Those working in ecumenical ministries felt accountable both to "other" groups (36%) and to annual conferences (27%), the "other" groups being primarily ecumenical agencies or other denominations sponsoring their ministry.

TABLE 27. IMPORTANCE OF POSSIBLE GOVERNING BOARD ROLES

	Mean Rank Assigned*	
	Current Role	Ideal Role in Opinion of Respondents
Policy setting	1.7	1.9
Evaluation of ministry	2.9	2.8
Personal counsel to staff	3.6	3.9
Interpretation of ministry	4.2	3.5
Fund raising	4.6	4.3
Implementation of program	4.9	4.6

* The most important role was to be assigned a rank of 1.

TABLE 28. LOCUS OF ACCOUNTABILITY OF CAMPUS MINISTRIES

	All Respon- dents*	Chaplains	Wesley Foundation Directors	Ecumenical Ministers
Annual Conference	38.7%	11.1%	62.8%	27.0%
Institution with which affiliated	17.1	53.3	2.3	11.1
Local congregations	2.3	0.0	3.5	1.6
General church board	2.3	0.0	2.3	3.2
Other group	17.1	6.7	9.3	36.5
Combinations of groups	15.8	15.6	15.1	17.5
No Response	6.8	13.3	4.7	3.2
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Number	222	45	86	63

* Includes respondents who did not indicate type of position and those occupying positions other than the three types shown in the table.

4. Services for Campus Ministry

Campus ministers receive services designed to assist their ministry from a number of sources. The most important national sources are the Board of Higher Education and Ministry (BHEM) and United Ministries in Higher Education (UMHE). A third of the ministers reported receiving services from BHEM, a fifth from UMHE, and a quarter from both sources.

As would be expected, ministers in different types of campus ministry positions tended to receive services from different sources. Almost half the ministers in ecumenical positions received services exclusively from UMHE and another quarter from both UMHE and BHEM. Wesley Foundation directors tended to obtain services from BHEM or a combination of BHEM and UMHE. BHEM was the most important source of services for chaplains, but the high proportion of non-respondents among the chaplains suggests that many of them may not receive any national services.

The campus ministers were given a list of nine services provided by BHEM and/or UMHE and were asked how important those services were in their own ministries, how often they used the services, and how

TABLE 29. SOURCES OF NATIONAL SERVICES FOR CAMPUS MINISTRY

	All Respon- dents*	Chaplains	Wesley Foundation Directors	Ecumenical Ministers
BHEM**	32.0%	33.3%	46.5%	11.1%
UMHE**	22.5	11.1	16.3	47.6
BHEM and UMHE**	27.9	22.2	27.9	28.6
Other	6.3	4.4	5.8	4.8
No response	11.3	29.0	3.5	7.9
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Number	222	45	86	60

* Includes respondents who did not indicate type of position and those occupying positions other than the three types shown in the table.

** Includes a few who use other services in addition.

they assessed the quality of the services. The services considered most important were aid in planning and goal setting, study and review of campus ministry programs, and assistance in interpretation. These were also the most frequently used services. Evaluations of importance tended to be similar among ministers in different types of campus ministry positions with the exception that those in ecumenical positions assigned greater importance than others to aid in the interpretive process and to services for the community college ministry, a UMHE program. Ministers in ecumenical positions also tended to use all of the services with greater frequency than did others.

As rated by the ministers who used them, the highest quality services were aid in planning and goal setting closely followed by study and review of campus ministry programs and personnel counseling. The lowest quality rating was assigned to the medical ethics ministry and to legal education services, but most of the services were rated medium high in quality. Ecumenical ministers, who tended to use all the services more frequently, also tended to rate most of them more highly than did their colleagues.

When asked what could be done to improve the quality and accessibility of national services, the most frequent answer was greater contact and more information about the services. When asked about critically needed additional services, almost a third of the 68 ministers who re-

TABLE 30. CAMPUS MINISTERS' ASSESSMENT OF IMPORTANCE AND QUALITY OF NATIONAL SERVICES

	Mean Rating Assigned *	
	Importance	Quality
Planning and goal setting	2.3	2.4
Self-study and review	2.4	2.4
Interpretive process	2.5	2.7
Personnel counseling	3.0	2.4
Career development program	3.1	2.6
Personnel placement	3.2	2.7
Medical ethics issues ministry	3.8	3.0
Community college ministry	4.0	2.9
Legal education	4.2	3.4

* Ratings were: 1—extremely high; 2—high; 3—medium; 4—low; 5—none (importance) or very low (quality).

TABLE 31. FREQUENCY OF USE OF SERVICES BY CAMPUS MINISTERS

	Number Responding	Percent Choosing Each Response			
		Regularly	Occasionally	Never	No Response
Self-study and review	222	27.9%	44.1%	16.7%	11.3%
Planning and goal setting	222	36.9%	34.2%	16.7%	12.2%
Interpretive process	222	30.2%	41.9%	14.9%	13.1%
Personnel placement	222	7.2%	42.3%	36.0%	14.4%
Personnel counseling	222	13.1%	37.8%	37.4%	11.7%
Career development program	222	9.0%	39.2%	39.6%	12.2%
Community college ministry	222	8.1%	19.8%	59.0%	13.1%
Medical ethics issues ministry	222	5.0%	30.2%	51.8%	13.1%
Legal education	222	0.0%	21.2%	65.8%	13.1%

sponded cited a need for assistance in developing program resources, and a quarter asked for assistance in fund raising. Wesley Foundation directors indicated a particular need for program resources while ecumenical ministers requested assistance in fund raising.

Provision of special professional education for campus ministers is one service that could be very useful. Over 80% of the respondents thought such education was needed to prepare an individual for campus ministry. Of those listing specific educational needs, almost a third mentioned information about problems of higher education and the role of the church in higher education. Many expressed a need for training in specific skills such as interpretation, program planning, and counseling. Over 85% of the ministers indicated a need for in-service training after beginning campus ministry. The improvement of program development, and interpersonal and management skills was the type of training most often desired. Chaplains and ministers in ecumenical situations also expressed a desire to keep abreast of developments in academic fields. Two-thirds of the ministers had engaged in some sort of formal continuing education during the preceding two years. Education in counseling and guidance was the sort of training most often received, no doubt reflecting the emphasis of all campus ministries on pastoral care of students.

5. Conclusion

The United Methodist Church was a catalytic agent in the development of campus ministry work. The church has continued its work on the campus out of a positive concern for and desire to minister to all persons in higher education.

Campus ministry is distinguished from other ministries of The United Methodist Church by its setting, on college and university campuses. It is similar to all other ministries, however, in following the model of the wholeness of the ministry of Christ to the total community. This concept of wholeness means that all ministry, including campus ministry, must be concerned with the pastoral, priestly, prophetic, and governance aspects of the church's mission.

In evaluating the importance of various aspects of campus ministry programs in their responses to the National Commission survey, United Methodist campus ministers showed the concern for persons, for the community of faith, for values, for freedom of inquiry, and for global perspectives that should characterize campus—and indeed all—ministry. Their responses suggest, however, that the primary emphasis of campus ministry programs is pastoral, caring for the religious and personal needs of individual members of the campus community. Of the other three modes, the greatest emphasis was given to the prophetic activities of ministry. Responses to specific survey items suggest that the availability of the intellectual resources of the academic community and its commitment to study and criticism lead campus based ministries to an active consideration of social, economic, and political problems from the campus to the global level. Many ministers expressed a desire to have their ministries serve as catalysts for study and action on a range of issues. They expressed the belief that their denominational constituency did not consider prophetic ministry to be as important as did campus ministers, but believed they and their constituents agreed on the primacy of pastoral care.

A continuing task of campus ministry is to be responsive to emerging needs of higher education. That response should not take the form of mere reaction to, and attempt to keep pace with, change, but it should be one of actively bringing the insights of the church to bear on new educational and social developments. In our time, changes that must be

addressed by campus ministers include: the expansion of higher educational opportunities beyond traditional limitations of age and place; the increasing racial, ethnic and theological pluralism of the campus community; the rapid growth of community colleges; and the growing emphasis on career education which may further reduce attention given to liberal studies and to moral and ethical inquiry. Many of these changes suggest a need to involve local congregations and ministers in the church's mission in higher education and to develop new patterns of staffing in order to utilize more fully the resources of the church in its ministry on the campus. The survey responses showed that most campus ministers were aware of the need to respond to these changes and supported the development of new strategies for carrying out the church's mission on the campus.

In order for United Methodist campus ministry to fulfill its mission, it must have the support—spiritual, organizational, and financial—of The United Methodist Church. Campus ministers, in turn, must work with other members of the church to assure the accountability of campus ministry to the church as a whole. Accountability should not be a limiting influence, hampering campus ministry, but should involve a positive and mutual attempt to assure that campus ministry serves the mission of the church and to utilize in the councils of the church the experience, insights, and commitments of those who minister on the campus.

APPENDICES



APPENDIX A

DATA ON RESPONSE RATE AND PERSONAL BACKGROUNDS OF CAMPUS MINISTERS

TABLE A.1. NUMBER OF CAMPUS MINISTERS ON MAILING LIST,
NUMBER OF SURVEYS RETURNED, AND PERCENTAGE RESPONSE
RATE

	Chaplains at United Methodist Institutions	Other Campus Ministers*	Total
Number of names on original mailing list	84	338	422
Number of surveys not deliverable **	5	13	18
Corrected number on mailing list	79	325	404
Number of usable returns	40	182	222
Returns as a percent of corrected mailing list	50%	56%	55%

* Includes Wesley Foundation directors, ministers in ecumenical campus ministries, local church staff members, and chaplains at non-United Methodist institutions.

** Includes surveys returned as undeliverable and responses indicating the recipient was not really a campus minister.

TABLE A.2. AGE OF RESPONDENTS AT TIME OF SURVEY

Under 30	7%
30-39	35
40-49	43
50-59	13
60 or older	13
Total	100%
Number	222

TABLE A.3. SEX OF RESPONDENTS

Female	9%
Male	90
No response	1
Total	100%
Number	222

TABLE A.4. RACE OF RESPONDENTS

Black	6%
White	93
Other	1
Total	100%
Number	222

TABLE A.5. RESPONDENTS' HIGHEST EARNED GENERAL EDUCATION DEGREE

Bachelor's	54%
Master's	25
Doctorate	18
No Response	3
Total	100%
Number	222

TABLE A.6. RESPONDENTS' HIGHEST LEVEL OF THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

None	1%
Some seminary	3
Seminary graduate	60
Graduate training	35
No response	1
Total	100%
Number	222

TABLE A.7. NUMBER OF YEARS SPENT BY RESPONDENTS IN CAMPUS MINISTRY

Less than 4 years	28%
4- 5 years	13
6- 9 years	21
10-14 years	16
15-19 years	12
20-24 years	5
25 years or more	3
No response	2
Total	100%
Number	222

APPENDIX B

FACTOR ANALYSIS OF MISSION, FUNCTION AND ORGANIZATIONAL STATEMENTS

In order to determine whether there might be a small number of basic issues in terms of which campus ministers evaluated specific goals and activities, the statistical technique of factor analysis was applied to the survey responses. Factor analysis is a technique that searches for patterns in relationships among sets of data, in this case the responses to the survey items. Application of factor analysis results in a list of "factors" which can be considered to represent certain underlying dimensions of the data. It identifies sets of apparently interrelated items and indicates the relative importance of each of those items in making up a particular factor. By looking at the items that are highly related to each factor, one can infer the underlying dimension that that particular factor appears to identify. In the case of the campus ministry survey, the factors appear to identify some underlying issues that form a framework for the ministers' analysis of their campus ministry programs. The assumption behind a factor analysis of their responses is that the campus ministers' positions on those underlying issues tended to determine their responses to the larger number of more specific questions contained in the survey.

Caution must be exercised in the use of factor analysis because once the technique has produced the factors, interpretation of their meaning is largely subjective and determined by what makes sense to the analyst. The technique is one of looking at the particular items that have high values in a given factor and determining whether they indeed appear to identify some real underlying dimension in the issue under study. This determination is based on professional judgment and the analyst's knowledge of the subject matter.

The results of the factor analysis of the campus ministry survey do seem to identify certain underlying issues. Appendix Table B.1 displays the factors produced when factor analysis was applied to responses to the question of how important the goals, functions, and activities *should* be in campus ministry. The name given to each factor was determined by inspection and analysis of the items identified as being important in the composition of that factor. The items included in each factor are

listed in Appendix Table B.2 so that readers may determine whether an underlying issue of campus ministry has indeed been identified.

The five factors identified by the factor analysis and some examples of specific issues and activities related to those factors are: social justice—problems of racism, sexism, social change; improvement of campus ministry organization and management—staff development, planning, interpretation; concern for spiritual life of students—evangelism, religious nurture; pastoral care—counseling and personal assistance; and critique of the university. These factors were defined by 29 of the 53 survey items.

TABLE B.1. LIST OF UNDERLYING FACTORS IN RESPONSES TO "OUGHT" QUESTIONS, DETERMINED BY FACTOR ANALYSIS

Factor Name	Number of Survey Items Included in Definition of This Factor
Social justice	10
Improvement of campus ministry organization and management	5
Concern for spiritual life of students	8
Pastoral care	4
Critique and analysis of the university	2

TABLE B.2. FACTORS PRODUCED BY FACTOR ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS CONCERNING IMPORTANCE VARIOUS PURPOSES, FUNCTIONS AND ACTIVITIES SHOULD HAVE IN CAMPUS MINISTRY PROGRAMS

Factor Loading	Factor Names and Survey Items Defining Each Factor
<i>Factor 1: SOCIAL JUSTICE</i>	
.76	To further an understanding of liberation theology, racism, and sexism
.72	To direct ministries toward women and ethnic minorities
.67	To involve women and minorities in the leadership of campus ministries
.54	To operate ministries with the widest possible ecumenical involvement
.50	To advocate humane and meaningful change through the structures of the college/university
.49	To focus on personal ministry for drug abusers, homosexuals and others in special circumstances
.48	To provide opportunities for students to explore and discuss sexuality, male/female roles, etc.
.45	To increase the international awareness of students and faculty

TABLE B.2. (Continued)

Factor Loading	Factor Names and Survey Items Defining Each Factor
.41	To develop ministries for dealing with changing and alternate lifestyles
.41	To initiate and nurture discussions among people in higher education, the church, and the community on issues of common concern
Factor 2: IMPROVEMENT OF CAMPUS MINISTRY ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT	
.66	To establish guidelines for continuing education of staff
.60	To develop newsletters and other media for interpreting campus ministry to campus community and local churches
.60	To develop support communities for campus ministry staff
.59	To engage in systematic planning, budgeting and evaluation procedures
.58	To utilize UMHE regional secretaries for training workshops for staff and board members
Factor 3: CONCERN FOR SPIRITUAL LIFE OF STUDENTS	
.58	To involve students in an inter-collegiate Christian movement
.58	To care primarily for United Methodist students on campus
.56	To protect students from atheistic and secular influences on campus
.55	To organize evangelistic programs on campus
.50	To acquaint students, faculty, and administrators with local church opportunities
.46	To provide opportunities for creative use of leisure time on campus communities
.43	To carry out on campus what local churches are attempting in their ministry in the community
.40	To assist local churches in their ministries with young adults
Factor 4: PASTORAL CARE	
.66	To provide a caring presence for persons in higher education
.52	To assist persons in their search for religious identity
.52	To provide pastoral counseling
.43	To provide a ministry for all persons on campus
Factor 5: CRITIQUE OF THE UNIVERSITY	
.70	To develop the concept of the morality of knowledge as a useful concept for critical inquiry into the nature and purpose of the university
.49	To provide the university community with theological resources for the discussion of teaching-learning dilemmas

APPENDIX C

SURVEY OF UNITED METHODIST CAMPUS MINISTERS

74

GOALS, FUNCTIONS, ACTIVITIES

Listed below are statements of goals, functions, and activities that might be part of a campus ministry program. You are asked to examine each statement from three perspectives:

1. In the first row, labeled "**NOW**," circle the answer that best describes how important that goal, function, or activity is in the *current* program of your campus ministry.
2. In the second row, labeled "**OUGHT**," circle the answer that best describes your beliefs concerning how important that function, goal, or activity *ought* to be in your campus ministry.
3. In the third row, labeled "**CONSTITUENCY**," circle the answer that best describes *your perception* of the beliefs of your United Methodist constituency regarding the importance that function, goal, or activity *should have* in your campus ministry.

An example is given below.

EXAMPLE:

To develop future leaders for the church.

IMPORTANCE					
	extreme- ly high	high	medium	low	none or not applicable
NOW	1	2	3	4	5
OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5

73

IMPORTANCE

		extreme- ly high	high	medium	low	none or not applicable
1. To relate the Christian Gospel to issues of concern in the academic community and in the world.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5
2. To provide pastoral counseling.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5
3. To engage in in-depth studies of staff, program and governance structure at intervals of five years.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5
4. To provide the college/university community with theological resources for the discussion of teaching-learning dilemmas.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5
5. To develop the concept of "the morality of knowledge" as a useful concept for critical inquiry into the nature and purpose of the college/university.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5
6. To increase the international awareness of students and faculty.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5
7. To direct ministries toward women and ethnic minorities.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5

		IMPORTANCE				
		extreme- ly high	high	medium	low	none or not applicable
8. To help interrelate the resources of university, community, and churches for specific activities.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5
9. To carry out on campus what local churches are attempting in their ministry in the community.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5
10. To develop strategies for impacting state legislatures with church concerns in public higher education.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5
11. To supplement opportunities for career and vocational counseling on the campus.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5
12. To provide a caring presence for persons in higher education.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5
13. To focus on personal ministries for drug abusers, homosexuals, and other groups in special circumstances.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5
14. To provide a ministry for all persons on campus.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5

15. To be the Church on campus.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5
16. To develop ministries for dealing with changing and alternate life styles.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5
17. To establish resources for emergency aid, scholarships, and short-term loans for students.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5
18. To organize evangelistic programs on campus.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5
19. To further an understanding of liberation theology, and the social phenomena of racism and sexism.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5
20. To provide opportunities for students to explore and discuss sexuality, male-female roles, etc.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5
21. To provide opportunities for study in Christian doctrine, religious beliefs, and church (denominational) polity.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5
22. To involve women and minorities in the leadership of campus ministries.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5

IMPORTANCE

		extreme- ly high	high	medium	low	none or not applicable
23. To equip professional staff for teaching responsibilities in departments of religion.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5
24. To organize groups for study and action upon special concerns and problems raised in the college/university.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5
25. To care primarily for United Methodist students on campus.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5
26. To provide opportunities for creative use of leisure time in campus communities.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5
27. To search for non-judicatory sources of financial support for special projects.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5
28. To design and implement student opinion surveys regarding events and problems impacting the college/university.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5
29. To be aware of the issues raised in various communication organs on campus.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5

30. To advocate humane and meaningful change through the structures of the college/university.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5
31. To witness to the Christian gospel among competing faiths and ideologies in the academic community.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5
32. To move toward area ministries serving more than one campus.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5
33. To help define the nature and unique possibilities of community colleges.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5
34. To be recognized by the academic community as having useful resources and leadership skills.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5
35. To assist local churches in their ministries with young adults.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5
36. To initiate and nurture discussions among people in higher education, the church, and the community on issues of common concern.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5
37. To identify and nurture pre-theological students.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5

IMPORTANCE

		extreme- ly high	high	medium	low	none or not applicable
38. To establish guidelines for continuing education of staff.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5
39. To operate ministries with the widest possible ecumenical involvement.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5
40. To protect students from atheistic and secular influences on campus.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5
41. To assist local churches to understand and become involved in issues of higher education.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5
42. To facilitate ministries to dorm students.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5
43. To utilize UHME regional secretaries for training workshops for staff and board members.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5
44. To provide for a worshipping community on campus.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5

45. To engage in systematic planning, budgeting and evaluation procedures.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5
46. To work closely with continuing education facilities to make them responsive to community needs.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5
47. To assist persons in their search for religious identity.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5
48. To acquaint students, faculty, and administrators with local church opportunities.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5
49. To involve students in an intercollegiate Christian movement.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5
50. To convert facilities and property into investment capital for assuring expanded and continued ministry.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5
51. To assist local churches to formulate goals dealing with community needs.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5
52. To develop support communities for campus ministry staff.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	OUGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5

		I M P O R T A N C E				
		extreme- ly high	high	medium	low	none or not applicable
53. To develop newsletters and other media for interpretation of campus ministry to the campus community and in local churches.	NOW	1	2	3	4	5
	UGHT	1	2	3	4	5
	CONSTITUENCY	1	2	3	4	5

INSTRUCTIONS: The following sections request various types of information about your campus ministry. Please write in the necessary information or check or circle the most appropriate answer, as indicated.

INSTITUTIONAL AFFILIATION

54. Please check the position you hold as a primary responsibility.

- ☐ a) Chaplain
- ☐ b) Wesley Foundation
- ☐ c) Ecumenical campus ministry
- ☐ d) Local church staff member
- ☐ e) Other (please describe) _____

55. Are you: ☐ a) Lay? ☐ b) Ordained?

56. Is the campus ministry to which you are assigned:

- ☐ a) At a single educational institution?
- ☐ b) At more than one educational institution?

57. Type of institutional affiliation(s) (check all appropriate):

- ☐ a) State college/ university
- ☐ b) Community college
- ☐ c) United Methodist institution
- ☐ d) Other church related
- ☐ e) Independent/ non-church related

58. How many students in the institution(s)? _____

MINISTRY PROGRAM AND ORGANIZATION

59. Would you provide the campus ministry's actual expenditures for 1973-74 and 1975-76 and its budget for 1976-77?

	1973-74 actual	1975-76 actual	1976-77 budget
Professional staff expenses	_____	_____	_____
Support staff expenses	_____	_____	_____
Program	_____	_____	_____
Building expenses	_____	_____	_____
Other _____	_____	_____	_____
Total expenditures	_____	_____	_____

59/ A. What are the primary reasons for changes, if any?

60. What have been the sources of your funds? Please use actual income for 1973-74 and 1975-76 and anticipated income for 1976-77.

82

	1973-74 actual	1975-76 actual	1976-77 anticipated
Annual conference	_____	_____	_____
Ecumenical agency	_____	_____	_____
Local church support	_____	_____	_____
Institution to which affiliated	_____	_____	_____
Other _____	_____	_____	_____
Total income (all sources)	_____	_____	_____

60/A. What are the major reasons for change, if any?

61. How many paid persons are on the staff?

	professional	support
Part-time	_____	_____
Full-time	_____	_____

62. Has there been any change in the number of staff during the past two years?

_____ a) Yes _____ b) No

62/A. If "Yes," was the change an _____ a) increase or _____ b) decrease?

63. Toward which group(s) is the ministry directed?

	number involved in program	percent of professional staff time given to group
Students	_____	_____
Faculty and administrators	_____	_____
Community residents	_____	_____
Local congregations	_____	_____
Other _____	_____	_____

64. What is the size of your governing board? _____

65. How often does your governing board meet? _____

66. What is the average attendance at regular board meetings: _____

67. What percentage of your board is recruited in each of the following ways?

- _____ a) Recruited by the staff and/or board of the ministry
 _____ b) Recruited or nominated by the judicatory
 _____ c) Recruited by other means: _____

68. Please indicate the extent of your agreement with the following statements by circling the answer that best represents your opinion.

	fully agree	partially agree	uncertain	partially disagree	totally disagree
a. The board is adequate in its pluralistic composition (men, women, minorities).	1	2	3	4	5

	fully agree 1	partially agree 2	uncertain 3	partially disagree 4	totally disagree 5
b. The board is adequate in its representation of students, institutional persons, and annual conference representatives.					
c. The board maintains an active involvement with the judicatory.					

69. What is the current role of your governing board? Please rank the following possible roles using 1 as most important, 2 as second most important, etc. Do not rank any that do not apply.

- ☐ Policy setting
- ☐ Personal counsel to staff
- ☐ Evaluation of the ministry
- ☐ Fund raising
- ☐ Implementing program
- ☐ Interpretation of ministry
- ☐ Other (please describe) _____

70. What *should* be the role of your governing board? Rank the following roles using 1 as most important, 2 as second most important, etc. Do not rank any that you think the board should not perform.

- ☐ Policy setting
- ☐ Personal counsel to staff
- ☐ Evaluation of the ministry
- ☐ Fund raising
- ☐ Implementing program
- ☐ Interpretation of ministry
- ☐ Other (please describe) _____

71. Have processes for goal development, planning, and priority setting been adequately established in your ministry?

_____ a) Yes

_____ b) No

NATIONAL SERVICES ASSISTING CAMPUS MINISTRY

72. Is national servicing for your ministry from

_____ a) UMHE?

_____ b) United Methodist Board of Higher Education and Ministry?

_____ c) Other? (please describe) _____

73. How important, in your own campus ministry, are the following services?

	extreme- ly high	high	medium	low	none or not applicable
Self study and review	1	2	3	4	5
Planning and goal setting	1	2	3	4	5
Interpretive process	1	2	3	4	5
Personnel/placement	1	2	3	4	5
Personnel counseling	1	2	3	4	5
Career development program	1	2	3	4	5
Community college ministry	1	2	3	4	5
Medical ethics issues ministry	1	2	3	4	5
Legal education	1	2	3	4	5

74. How often do you use those services?

	regularly	occasionally	never
Self study and review	1	2	3
Planning and goal setting	1	2	3
Interpretive process	1	2	3
Personnel/placement	1	2	3
Personnel counseling	1	2	3
Career development program	1	2	3
Community college ministry	1	2	3
Medical ethics issues ministry	1	2	3
Legal education	1	2	3

88

75. How would you assess the quality of the services rendered?

	very high	high	medium	low	very low	no basis for evaluation
Self study and review	1	2	3	4	5	6
Planning and goal setting	1	2	3	4	5	6
Interpretive process	1	2	3	4	5	6
Personnel/placement	1	2	3	4	5	6
Personnel counseling	1	2	3	4	5	6
Career development program	1	2	3	4	5	6
Community college ministry	1	2	3	4	5	6
Medical ethics issues ministry	1	2	3	4	5	6
Legal education	1	2	3	4	5	6

89

76. What could be done to improve the quality and accessibility of services?

77. What additional services are critically needed?

78. What services would be helpful although not critical?

79. How useful to you are the following publications?

	very useful	somewhat useful	not useful	no basis for evaluation
<i>Connexion</i> (UHME)	1	2	3	4
<i>Happenings</i> (Section on Campus Ministry)	1	2	3	4
<i>Occasional Papers</i> (Board of Higher Education and Ministry)	1	2	3	4

80. How important is it for campus ministries to work ecumenically?

very important	important	medium importance	low importance	not at all important
1	2	3	4	5

ANNUAL CONFERENCE RELATIONS

05

81. What one word best describes your feeling about being in a special appointment (if you are ordained)?

82. Do you have adequate opportunity to be involved in annual conference activities?

_____ a) Yes _____ b) No

83. How often have you been involved in annual conference activities during the past year?

- _____ a) Not been involved at all
- _____ b) One activity, committee, or the like
- _____ c) Two - five activities
- _____ d) Six or more activities

PROFESSIONAL CAREER

84. What did you do prior to becoming involved in campus ministry?

- _____ a) Pastor
- _____ b) In school
- _____ c) Other educational work
- _____ d) Other (please describe) _____

80

85. What were your primary reasons for becoming a campus minister? Please rank the following using 1 as most important.

Do not rank any that do not apply.

- ☐ Sense of mission/calling
- ☐ Influence of a person
- ☐ Stimulation of academic setting
- ☐ Desire to work with young people
- ☐ Freedom from parish type restraints
- ☐ Frustration with other forms of ministry
- ☐ Opportunity for personal fulfillment
- ☐ Other (please describe) _____

86. How did you secure your present position?

- ☐ a) Through personnel placement of UMHE
- ☐ b) Annual conference appointment processes
- ☐ c) Personal contacts
- ☐ d) Other (please describe) _____

87. How long do you want to remain in campus ministry?

- ☐ a) Remainder of my career
- ☐ b) A short time (less than 5 years)
- ☐ c) Want out immediately
- ☐ d) Uncertain

88. Where do you look for your primary peer relationships?

- ☐ a) Annual conference
- ☐ b) Institution with which affiliated
- ☐ c) Campus ministers
- ☐ d) Other (who)? _____

89. Do you teach in the institution(s)?

_____ a) Yes _____ b) No

89/A. If yes, what proportion of your total work week is involved with teaching? _____

90. In each of the following pairs of statements about campus ministry as a career, check the *one* which you believe to be most accurate.

- a) _____ People continue to work in campus ministry largely because they want to.
_____ People continue to work in campus ministry largely because they become locked in.
- b) _____ Campus ministers can make a good exit into other ministries if they wish to.
_____ They cannot do so.
- c) _____ Campus ministers can make a good exit into a secular career if they wish to.
_____ They cannot do so.

91. Do you belong to NCMA?

_____ a) Yes _____ b) No

92. To what other professional associations do you belong?

93. Do you think persons need special training prior to entering campus ministry?

_____ a) Yes _____ b) No

93/A. If "Yes," what type of training?

94. Do you think that campus ministers need in-service training?

_____ a) Yes

_____ b) No

94/A. If "Yes," what type of training?

95. Have you had any formal continuing education during the past two years?

_____ a) Yes

_____ b) No

95/A. If "Yes," what type?

96. The activities of campus ministries have sometimes been described in terms of the four modes listed below.

- in the column labeled "Should," write in the percent of professional staff time which you believe should be allocated to each of these modes in the campus ministry in which you now serve.
- In the column labeled "Actual," write in the percent of professional staff time which is actually spent on each of these modes in your current campus ministry.

should actual

- | | | |
|-------|-------|--|
| _____ | _____ | Pastoral (teaching, counseling, nurture) |
| _____ | _____ | Priestly (worship, sacraments) |
| _____ | _____ | Prophetic (justice, human freedom) |
| _____ | _____ | Governance (use of power, systems) |

97. To whom should campus ministries be primarily accountable?

☐ a) Local congregations

☐ d) General church board

☐ b) Annual conference

☐ e) Other: _____

☐ c) Institution(s) to which affiliated

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

98. Year of birth _____

99. Sex: ☐ a) Female

☐ b) Male

100. What is your current marital status?

☐ a) Single

☐ b) Married

☐ c) Divorced

101. Race/ethnic identity:

☐ a) Black

☐ b) White

☐ c) Other

102. Professional theological education (Please check all appropriate)

☐ a) None

☐ b) Bible College graduate

☐ c) Some seminary

☐ d) Seminary graduate (B.D., M.Div., etc.)

☐ e) Advanced graduate training in theological studies (D.Min., S.T.D., Th.D., etc.)

103. General educational background (Please check all appropriate)

- ☐ a) Less than college degree
- ☐ b) College degree
- ☐ c) Earned Master's (other than professional, i.e., M.A.)
- ☐ d) Earned doctorate (other than professional, i.e., Ph.D.)

104. Year of ordination (Elder) _____

105. Number of years in campus ministry _____

106. Number of years in present position _____

107. State in which you work _____

COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES AFFILIATED WITH THE UNITED METHODIST CHURCH

Adrian College
Adrian, Michigan

Alaska Methodist University
Anchorage, Alaska

Albion College
Albion, Michigan

Albright College
Reading, Pennsylvania

Allegheny College
Meadville, Pennsylvania

American University
Washington, D.C.

Andrew College
Cuthbert, Georgia

Baker University
Baldwin City, Kansas

Baldwin-Wallace College
Berea, Ohio

Bennett College
Greensboro, North Carolina

Bethune-Cookman College
Daytona Beach, Florida

Birmingham-Southern College
Birmingham, Alabama

Boston University
Boston, Massachusetts

Brevard College
Brevard, North Carolina

Centenary College of La.
Shreveport, Louisiana

Centenary College for Women
Hackettstown, New Jersey

Central Methodist College
Fayette, Missouri

Clarke College
Orangeburg, South Carolina

Clark College
Atlanta, Georgia

Columbia College
Columbia, South Carolina

Cornell College
Mount Vernon, Iowa

Dakota Wesleyan University
Mitchell, South Dakota

DePauw University
Greencastle, Indiana

Dickinson College
Carlisle, Pennsylvania

Dillard University
New Orleans, Louisiana

Drew University
Madison, New Jersey

Duke University
Durham, North Carolina

Emory and Henry College
Emory, Virginia

Emory University
Atlanta, Georgia

Ferrum College
Ferrum, Virginia

Florida Southern College
Lakeland, Florida

Green Mountain College
Poultney, Vermont

Greensboro College
Greensboro, North Carolina

Hamline University
St. Paul, Minnesota

Hawaii Le College
Kaneohe, Hawaii

Hendrix College
Conway, Arkansas

High Point College
High Point, North Carolina

Hiwassee College
Madisonville, Tennessee

Huntingdon College
Montgomery, Alabama

Huston-Tillotson College
Austin, Texas

Illinois Wesleyan University
Bloomington, Illinois

Indiana Central University
Indianapolis, Indiana

Iowa Wesleyan College
Mount Pleasant, Iowa

Kansas Wesleyan
Salina, Kansas

Kendall College
Evanston, Illinois

Kentucky Wesleyan College
Owensboro, Kentucky

LaGrange College
LaGrange, Georgia

Lambuth College
Jackson, Tennessee

Lawrence University
Appleton, Wisconsin

Lebanon Valley College
Annville, Pennsylvania

Lindsey Wilson College
Columbia, Kentucky

Lon Morris College
Jacksonville, Texas

Louisburg College
Louisburg, North Carolina

Lycoming College
Williamsport, Pennsylvania

MacMurray College
Jacksonville, Illinois

Martin College
Pulaski, Tennessee

McKendree College
Lebanon, Illinois

McMurry College
Abilene, Texas

Meharry Medical College
Nashville, Tennessee

Methodist College
Fayetteville, North Carolina

Millsaps College
Jackson, Mississippi

Morningside College
Sioux City, Iowa

Morristown College
Morristown, Tennessee

Mount Union College
Alliance, Ohio

Nebraska Wesleyan University
Lincoln, Nebraska

North Carolina Wesleyan U.
Rocky Mount, North Carolina

North Central College
Naperville, Illinois

Ohio Northern University
Ada, Ohio

Ohio Wesleyan University
Delaware, Ohio

Oklahoma City University
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Otterbein College
Westerville, Ohio

Oxford College of Emory
Oxford, Georgia

Paine College
Augusta, Georgia

Pfeiffer College
Misenheimer, North Carolina

Philander Smith College
Little Rock, Arkansas

Randolph-Macon College
Ashland, Virginia

Randolph-Macon Woman's College
Lynchburg, Virginia

Reinhardt College
Waleska, Georgia

Rocky Mountain College
Billings, Montana

Rust College
Holly Springs, Mississippi

Scarritt College
Nashville, Tennessee

Shenandoah College
Winchester, Virginia

Simpson College
Indianola, Iowa

Southern Methodist University
Dallas, Texas

Southwestern College
Winfield, Kansas

Southwestern University
Georgetown, Texas

Spartanburg Methodist College
Spartanburg, South Carolina

Sue Bennett College
London, Kentucky

Syracuse University
Syracuse, New York

Tennessee Wesleyan College
Athens, Tennessee

Texas Wesleyan College
Fort Worth, Texas

Union College
Barbourville, Kentucky

University of Denver
Denver, Colorado

University of Evansville
Evansville, Indiana

University of Puget Sound
Tacoma, Washington

University of the Pacific
Stockton, California

Virginia Wesleyan College
Norfolk, Virginia

Wesleyan College
Macon, Georgia

Wesley College
Dover, Delaware

West Virginia Wesleyan College
Buckhannon, West Virginia

Westmar College
LeMars, Iowa

Westminster College
Salt Lake City, Utah

Wiley College
Marshall, Texas

Willamette University
Salem, Oregon

Wofford College
Spartanburg, South Carolina

Wood Junior College
Mathiston, Mississippi

Young Harris College
Young Harris, Georgia

UNITED METHODIST SEMINARIES AND SCHOOLS OF THEOLOGY

Boston University School of Theology
Boston, Massachusetts

Candler School of Theology
Atlanta, Georgia

Drew University, The Theological School
Madison, New Jersey

Duke University, The Divinity School
Durham, North Carolina

Gammon Theological Seminary
Atlanta, Georgia

Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary
Evanston, Illinois

Hilt School of Theology
Denver, Colorado

Methodist Theological School in Ohio
Delaware, Ohio

Perkins School of Theology
Southern Methodist University
Dallas, Texas

Saint Paul School of Theology
Kansas City, Missouri

School of Theology at Claremont
Claremont, California

United Theological Seminary
Dayton, Ohio

Wesley Theological Seminary
Washington, D.C.

UNITED METHODIST ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Boylan-Haven-Mather Academy
Camden, South Carolina

Holding Institute
Laredo, Texas

Kents Hill School
Kents Hill, Maine

Lydia Patterson Institute
El Paso, Texas

McCurdy School
Española, New Mexico

Navajo Methodist Mission School
Farmington, New Mexico

Pennington School
Pennington, New Jersey

Randolph-Macon Academy
Front Royal, Virginia

Rod Bird Settlement School
Beverly, Kentucky

Robinson School
Santurce, Puerto Rico

Sager-Brown School
Baldwin, Louisiana

Tilton School
Tilton, New Hampshire

Vashti School
Thomasville, Georgia

Wyoming Seminary
Kingston, Pennsylvania